UNIV. OF
TORONTO
LIBRARY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

http://www.archive.org/details/edinburghreviewo220londuoft

The Edinburgh Review

or Critical Journal

JULY, 1914 ——————— OCTOBER, 1914

To be continued Quarterly

Edited by HAROLD COX

JUDEX DAMNATUR CUM NOCENS ABSOLVITUR
Publius Syrus

VOL. 220

139639

LONGMANS, GREEN, & CO
London, Bombay, Calcutta, and Madras
LEONARD SCOTT PUBLICATION COMPANY, New York
1914

Contents of Vol. 220.

No. 449 — JULY, 1914

		PAGE
A Chapter of English Diplomacy, 1853-1871	J. A. R. MARRIOTT	1
The Referendum at Work	HORACE MICHELI	26
Servia Irredenta	FRANCIS GRIBBLE	41
The Expansion of Italy	ALGAR THOROLD	60
The Evolution of the Roman Campagna	LUIGI VILLARI	79
Some Aspects of West African Religions	P. AMAURY TALBOT	96
Greek Music	F. A. WRIGHT	115
Casanova	HORACE BLEACKLEY	135
The Pirates of Algiers	EVELYN MARCH PHILLIPPS	149
The Need of Preventive Detention	R. F. QUINTON	167
Current Literature	WALTER DE LA MARE	180
The English Universities and National Life	J. E. G. DE MONTMORENCY	196
The Rating of Site Values	EDITOR	215
The Comparative Study of Empire	SIDNEY LOW	239

No. 450 — OCTOBER, 1914

Germanism and Prussianism	SIDNEY LOW	257
Germany and the Laws of War	. . . . .	278
The German Colonies	SIR H. H. JOHNSTON, G.C.M.G., K.C.B.	298
War and Literature	EDMUND GOSSE, C.B.	313
The Red Cross	HENRY C. SHELLEY	333
Life in Croatia	RT. HON. W. F. BAILEY, C.B.	356
The National Records	. . . . .	373
Voltaire and England	LYTTON STRACHEY	392
Popular Poetry	WALTER DE LA MARE	412
The Future of China	J. O. P. BLAND	427
The War	EDITOR	452

The Edinburgh Review

JULY, 1914 No. 449

A CHAPTER OF ENGLISH DIPLOMACY—1853-1871

1. **The Life and Letters of the fourth Earl of Clarendon.** By Sir HERBERT MAXWELL. Edward Arnold. 1913.
2. **Lord Lyons : A Record of British Diplomacy.** By Lord NEWTON. Edward Arnold. 1913.
3. **Memoirs and Letters of Sir Robert Morier.** By his daughter, Mrs. ROSSLYN WEMYSS. Edward Arnold. 1911.
4. **The Overthrow of the Germanic Confederation by Prussia in 1866.** By Sir ALEXANDER MALET. Longmans, Green. 1870.
5. **The Confederation of Europe.** By W. A. PHILLIPS. Longmans, Green. 1914.

FEW Englishmen take a sustained and continuous interest in foreign policy. Fewer still make any serious study of the subject. When a war breaks out or a crisis threatens, people who like to be regarded as well informed make a scrambling effort to ' get up ' the points at issue, and amid a shoal of minnows they promptly pose as authoritative whales. But not outside the ranks of professional publicists and politicians, nor always perhaps within them, is there any systematic and scientific investigation of the difficult and devious ways of European diplomacy. To this rule the world of high finance is, of course, an exception ; that world, however, is not English but cosmopolitan.

For this characteristic ignorance and indifference many

All rights reserved.

reasons may be alleged. Owing to their insular detachment, Englishmen, it is said, have less need than their neighbours to concern themselves with international rivalries and with the conflicting ambitions of Continental States. Besides, questions of domestic policy are peculiarly absorbing in this country; earlier than any other nation in Europe or in the world we were called upon to confront the social and economic problems roused into fresh life, if not actually created, by the industrial revolution of the late eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries. There is substance in both these excuses or explanations; and there is even more in a third. People who take a somewhat wider view of their political responsibility are apt to allege that the true ambit of the external interests of Great Britain cannot be confined within the limits of European diplomacy; that, in Seeley's famous phrase, they are not thalassic but oceanic; that they touch Asia, Africa, and America more continuously and more intimately than Europe; in short, that to the citizen of a world-wide Empire the affairs of Europe are of secondary, if not negligible, significance.

This latter view represents a welcome and wholesome recoil against the confined outlook which was characteristic of the statesmen of the middle decades of the nineteenth century; and it contains, beyond question, a large element of truth. But another reaction is already in sight. Proper as it is to endeavour to appreciate the unique position of Great Britain in world-politics, it is not less important to understand that, despite reflex action at the extremities, the nerve centres are still mainly concentrated in Europe. Not less, therefore, to the student of *Weltpolitik* than to the diplomatist of the older school is a knowledge of *les mœurs politiques*—the traditions of the European courts and chancelleries—indispensable.

To such knowledge the works prefixed to this article make a material contribution. Lord Clarendon, Sir Robert Morier, and Lord Lyons each played a notable part on the stage of European politics during the mid-Victorian era. But the scenes of their activities were far apart. Lord Clarendon, though not without personal experience of Continental missions, spent most of his political life at the Foreign Office; Morier's experience was gained almost wholly in Germany; Lord Lyons's principal work was done in Paris.

Sir Herbert Maxwell's biography of Lord Clarendon, though not quite void of offence as regards the colleagues and contemporaries of his subject, is eminently satisfactory as a portrait of the central figure of the tale. To make that figure singularly attractive was not indeed a difficult task. Lord Clarendon was happy in the possession of high intellectual gifts, happier still in the affection of many friends, and happiest in his own sunny temper and in a character honourable and sincere. His mission in life was peacemaking—in the home circle; in his Party; in Continental diplomacy.

Born in 1800, George William Frederick Villiers entered the diplomatic service in 1820. Recalled from Petersburg in 1823 to become Commissioner of Customs, he was sent to Paris in 1831 by Lord Althorp, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, to negotiate a commercial treaty with France. Two years later Lord Palmerston appointed him Minister to Madrid, and there he remained until 1839. In 1838 he had succeeded his uncle as fourth Earl of Clarendon, and he desired to settle down at home. In 1839 he married, refused the Governor-Generalship of Canada and was admitted to the Cabinet as Lord Privy Seal. He went out with his Party in 1841; came in again in 1846 as President of the Board of Trade, and in 1847 became Lord Lieutenant of Ireland. As Lord Lieutenant, Clarendon was responsible for rescuing from famine a starving people, for quelling the 'Young Ireland' rebellion, and for passing the well-intentioned but disastrous Encumbered Estates Act of 1849. In the latter year he played host to Queen Victoria and Prince Albert. When Lord Palmerston was dismissed from the Foreign Office in 1851, it was regarded as certain that Lord Clarendon would succeed him, but the latter, always generous and complaisant, waived his strong claims in favour of Lord Granville. Two years later, however, Lord John Russell, who had temporarily taken the Foreign Office under Lord Aberdeen, relinquished it to Lord Clarendon. The latter, therefore, was responsible for the negotiations which preceded the outbreak of the Crimean War. At the Foreign Office he remained during the rest of Lord Aberdeen's Premiership and throughout Lord Palmerston's first administration, 1853–1858. Lord Derby pressed him to retain office when the Conservatives came into power in 1858, but he refused with some acerbity, and when,

in 1859, Lord Palmerston formed his second Cabinet Lord John Russell, to the annoyance of the Queen, insisted on having the Foreign Office for himself. Lord Clarendon, however, continued, though unofficially, to exercise much influence in foreign affairs until the way was re-opened to the Foreign Office by Lord Russell's accession to the Premiership (1865). Except during the interval of the Derby-Disraeli Government (1866–1868), Clarendon presided over the Foreign Office until his death in 1870.

Sir Robert Morier's diplomatic service in Germany coincided almost precisely with Lord Clarendon's successive periods at the Foreign Office. Appointed to the Vienna Embassy as unpaid attaché in 1853, Morier served at Berlin, at Frankfort, at Darmstadt, at Stuttgart, and at Munich, until, in 1876, he finally quitted Germany for Portugal.

In the same year (1853) that Morier embarked upon a diplomatic career in Germany, Lyons was entrusted with an important and semi-independent mission to Rome, and remained in Italy until 1858. From 1859 to 1865 he served as Minister at Washington ; he was transferred to the Embassy at Constantinople in 1865, and then as ambassador at Paris (1867–1887) he witnessed the outbreak of the Franco-German war, the fall of the Second Empire, and the establishment of the Third Republic.

It will be observed that the public careers of these three men—Clarendon, Morier, and Lyons—are curiously complementary, and that in the aggregate they contribute an important chapter to the history of English diplomacy. To gauge the significance of that chapter is the purpose of the pages that follow.

What was the diplomatic situation when, in 1853, Morier went to Vienna, Lyons to Rome, and Clarendon took up the reins at the Foreign Office ? The peace of Europe trembled at that moment in the balance. Napoleon III.—the designing villain of Kinglake's brilliant melodrama—had but lately (Dec. 1852) made himself Emperor of the French, and by the other crowned heads of Europe was regarded as little better than a successful *parvenu*. While still President of the Republic, Napoleon had made a bid for clerical support in France and for the favour of the Catholic Powers by reasserting

the claims of the Latin Church to the guardianship of the Holy Places in Palestine. Such reassertion naturally brought Napoleon into collision with the Czar Nicholas—the protector of the Greek monks then in possession. But to fix upon Napoleon exclusive or indeed primary responsibility for the outbreak of the Crimean war seems to ignore the operation of other forces which, if more remote, were not less potent. A study of *les mœurs politiques* reveals the fact that ever since the Treaty of Kainardji (1774) the Russian Czars had been aiming at a virtual protectorate over the Orthodox subjects of the Ottoman Sultan. To the Czar Nicholas it seemed that in 1853 the opportunity had arrived for the final assertion of this claim. It is fair to say that before taking overt action the Czar attempted, not for the first time, to come to a frank understanding with Great Britain in regard to the Eastern Question. When visiting England in 1844, he had opened his mind on the subject to Lord Aberdeen, then, at the Foreign Office, to Peel, and above all to the Prince Consort. He had then insisted that 'in the event of any unforeseen 'calamity befalling the Turkish Empire, Russia and England 'should agree together as to the course that should be pursued.' These overtures were resumed at Petersburg in January 1853. In two memorable interviews with Sir Hamilton Seymour the Czar, after a general survey of the Eastern Question, made certain specific suggestions for its solution. He proposed that the Danubian Principalities, Servia, and Bulgaria should be erected into independent States under Russian protection, and that England, in order to make absolutely secure her route to the Far East, should annex Crete, Cyprus, and Egypt. The English Ministers, who had been captivated by the personality of the Czar in 1844, were aghast at the coolness and candour of the proposals when submitted to them in 1853 through the ordinary diplomatic channels. They refused to admit that the dissolution of the 'sick man' was imminent; they repudiated with some heat the idea of a possible partition of his inheritance, and indignantly declined the specific proposals of the Czar. A foreign critic, quick to detect perfidy and hypocrisy in the policy of Albion, might be forgiven for observing that, while Russia is no nearer the Golden Horn than she was in 1853, Great Britain is in possession of both Cyprus and Egypt. It does not, perhaps, become an English critic to obtrude the point.

Repulsed in his efforts to come to terms with Great Britain, the Czar then determined to revert to the traditional policy of his House. The question of the Holy Places in Palestine was of secondary significance. It was, indeed, virtually settled when Prince Menschikoff, the rough soldier who represented the Czar at Constantinople, peremptorily demanded that the Sultan should make a virtual acknowledgment of the Czar's protectorate over all the Orthodox subjects of the Porte. This demand was based upon the seventh and fourteenth articles of the Treaty of Kainardji. But the text of that famous document shows that the Czar's demand involved a most extravagant and wholly unwarranted extension of very vague and indefinite engagements.* The Porte, inspired throughout the whole of these negotiations by Lord Stratford de Redcliffe, naturally declared the Czar's contention to be inadmissible.

The correspondence of Lord Clarendon throws additional and interesting light upon the relations which existed between the Cabinet and their masterful representative at the Porte. Sir James Graham, writing of 'his morbid vanities and implacable antipathies,' declares him to be capable, in the face of peremptory orders to the contrary, of advising the Turk to be refractory, and urges Lord Clarendon to be 'ready to supersede him without the loss of a day.' Superseded he would probably have been, had there been anyone to take his place. Lord Cowley, the only possible man, could not be spared from Paris. Lord Clarendon, though disposed to trust and support the 'man on the spot,' refers to Stratford as 'the real Sultan,' and admits that 'although he ostensibly and officially obeys his instructions he lets his dissent from them be known, and upon that the Turks act.'

To the Russian demand for the acknowledgment of their right to a protectorate over the Greek Christians Lord Clarendon was, however, quite as firmly opposed as was Lord Stratford; and, in the following despatch, he stated his grounds with unanswerable force and lucidity:

'No Sovereign,' he wrote, 'having a proper regard for his own dignity and independence could admit proposals so undefined as

* See Holland, 'Treaty Relations between Russia and Turkey,' pp. 41, 42.

those of Prince Menschikoff and by treaty confer upon another and more powerful Sovereign a right of protection over a large portion of his own subjects. However well disguised it may be, yet the fact is that under the vague language of the proposed Sened a perpetual right to interfere in the internal affairs of Turkey would be conferred upon Russia, for, governed as the Greek subjects of the Porte are by their ecclesiastical authorities, and looking as these latter would in all things do for protection to Russia, it follows that fourteen millions of Greeks would henceforth regard the Emperor as their supreme protector, and their allegiance to the Sultan would be little more than nominal, while his own independence would dwindle into vassalage.'

It is not within the scope of the present article to follow in detail the course of the negotiations which preceded the Crimean war, still less that of the actual military operations. It is, however, pertinent to refer to an article which appeared in this 'Review' in April 1863.* Written by the then Editor, Henry Reeve, it was carefully revised by Lord Clarendon himself. It may, therefore, be accepted as the authoritative *apologia* of the Aberdeen Cabinet. Primarily intended as a criticism of the first two volumes of Kinglake's 'Invasion of 'the Crimea,' it contains a merciless exposure of the shallow sophistries by which that brilliant romancer sought to fasten the responsibility for the war upon the Emperor Napoleon, and to exhibit Great Britain as the latter's unsuspecting dupe and innocent tool. Nothing, as the reviewer insists, could have been further from the truth. Great Britain was not 'drawn or driven along by another Power.' She adopted certain measures 'because they were demanded 'by her own conception of the duty she had to perform.' The critical point was reached with the rejection by Turkey of the Vienna Note, and that rejection was due to one man.

'No man ever took upon himself a larger amount of responsibility than Lord Stratford when he virtually overruled the decision of the four Powers, including his own Government, and acquiesced in—not to say caused—the rejection of the Vienna Note by the Porte after it had been accepted by Russia. The interpretation afterwards put upon that note by Count Nesselrode showed that he was right; but, nevertheless, that was the point on which the question of peace and war turned . . . Russia had formed the design to extort from Turkey, in one form or another, a right of

* Vol. cxvii. No. 240, pp. 307–352.

protection over the Christians. She never abandoned that design. She thought she could enforce it. The Western Powers interposed, and the strife began.'*

What did the war achieve? Sir Robert Morier perhaps expressed the current opinion when he described it as 'the 'only perfectly useless modern war that has been waged— 'useless, that is, from the point of view of public utility.' † A greater than Morier enshrined in classical phrase the opinion that in the Crimean war 'England put her money on the wrong 'horse.' Does the verdict of history endorse the judgement of Sir Robert Morier and Lord Salisbury, or does it incline to that of the late Duke of Argyll, who, towards the close of his life, avowed himself as quite unrepentant for his own share in the matter? ‡ What would have happened if the Western Powers had stood aside and permitted Russia to work her will upon the Turk? The Black Sea would have been converted into a Russian lake; Constantinople would have become a Russian outpost; the Czar would have been the sole and formal Protector of the Christian subjects of the Sultan, and Russia would have established an exclusive and dangerous domination in the Eastern waters of the Mediterranean. Could the mistress of India have contemplated these results with complacency? The Aberdeen Cabinet decided that she could not, and the best historical criticism tends towards an approval of that decision. That the immediate results of the war were not commensurate with the sacrifices it entailed may be admitted. That is true of almost every war. It is also true that the Crimean war appeared to redound much more to the credit of France, or rather of Napoleon, than of England. But the Power which gained most from it was neither England nor France, but Sardinia.

Among the diplomatists who, in March 1856, assembled in Congress at Paris by far the most striking personality was that of Count Cavour. To gain access to that Congress Cavour had overborne the opposition of his colleagues and had sent a Sardinian contingent to take its place side by side with the

* Edinburgh Review, cxvii. 331.
† Memoirs, ii. 215.
‡ Our Responsibilities for Turkey (1896), p. 10.

English and French armies in the Crimea. The Italian troops had done their work gallantly. In the waters of the Tchernaya the stain of Novara was wiped out for ever ; and out of the mud of the trenches before Sebastopol modern Italy was built. In the Congress of Paris Cavour took his place as the representative, not merely of Sardinia, but in a sense of Italy. To the tale of misgovernment and oppression unfolded by the Sardinian Premier the English representatives, Lord Clarendon and Lord Cowley, lent sympathetic but cautious ears. Napoleon was ready with something more than sympathy. The interest of the ex-Carbonaro in the destinies of Italy may have been inconstant, but it was genuine. 'Que peut-on faire pour l'Italie ?' was Napoleon's question to Cavour. The latter was ready with his answer ; the bargain was struck and sealed at Plombières in 1858, and in 1859 Europe was startled by the outbreak of the Franco-Sardinian war against Austria.

Napoleon's Italian policy has been very hardly judged both in England and in Italy itself. Lord Palmerston, writing to Clarendon at the height of the crisis (April 24, 1859), puts the whole case pithily and with characteristic directness :

> 'My belief is that, for many years past, Napoleon has had a fixed desire to improve the internal condition of Italy by freeing as much of that country as possible from the crushing weight of Austrian domination, and that he has at various times thought of various ways of attaining his object, but that his object has been one and the same ; and I must say that the end he has had in view is much to be wished for.' *

That Napoleon, whatever his motives, rendered an incomparable service to the cause of Italian freedom and Italian unity can hardly be denied by anyone conversant with the facts. True he demanded and obtained a heavy price for it, but even this is hardly sufficient to account for the fact that, with singular unanimity, the gratitude of modern Italy is denied to the 'magnanimous ally,' and is reserved for the friendly sympathiser—Great Britain.

How was that gratitude earned ? That the Italian question excited immense interest in England goes without saying. In the highest quarters it was regarded primarily from the point of view of the European equilibrium : the respect for

---

* Maxwell, op. cit. ii. 182.

existing treaties and the maintenance of peace. The attitude of the Court is generally described as pro-Austrian ; it would seem rather to have been anti-Napoleonic. The Queen, like many of her most experienced statesmen, including Lord Clarendon himself, was profoundly mistrustful of the Emperor of the French. At the other end of the social scale there was a small but interesting group of people who were in close sympathy and friendship with Mazzini and the exiles, and desired to see Italy not merely emancipated from a foreign yoke but united in adherence to republican institutions. The responsible leaders of English Liberalism held a middle position : they ardently hoped for freedom, but had not yet dreamed of unity.*

The Cabinet which came into office in June 1859 contained three men whose names are enshrined in the hearts of Italian patriots alongside those of Victor Emmanuel, Cavour, Garibaldi, and Mazzini. Lord Palmerston had long held the view that Austria would be better without Italy, and that Italy would be better without Austria. Lord John Russell had a general passion for ' freedom ' as understood by a typical English Whig, and particular sympathy with Italian aspirations. Mr. Gladstone had been moved to the deepest moral indignation by a sojourn in Naples (1850–1851), and by the sight of the tortures inflicted by the Government of the Two Sicilies upon political prisoners. His indignation found characteristic vent in two open letters addressed to Lord Aberdeen in July 1851, and in an article contributed to this ' Review ' in 1852.

Lord Palmerston sent copies of Mr. Gladstone's letters to all the British representatives in Continental capitals, and when asked to circulate, in similar fashion, the official reply of the Neapolitan Government he refused to send out a document ' consisting of a flimsy tissue of bare assertions and reckless ' denials, mixed up with coarse ribaldry and commonplace ' abuse.'

When the crisis came Lord Palmerston was out of office. Neither Lord Derby nor Lord Malmesbury shared Palmerston's enthusism for Italian liberties. Both shared their Sovereign's supreme anxiety to prevent an outbreak of war. To this end the Queen wrote an autograph letter to the Emperor Napoleon

* Cf. e.g. Morley's ' Gladstone,' i. 402, ii. 12.

(February 4, 1859), urging him to 'respect treaties,' and three weeks later Lord Cowley, who was still British Ambassador in Paris, was despatched on a mediatorial mission to Vienna. Lord Cowley was the bearer of an autograph letter from the Queen to the Emperor of Austria.*

But the time for mediation or for friendly solicitation had in truth gone by. The pact of Plombières was in force. Cavour was bent on war; Austria played into his hands. On the 23rd of April 1859 Austria peremptorily demanded the disarmament of Piedmont; Cavour gleefully accepted the challenge; a French army was immediately landed at Genoa, and on the 13th of May Victor Emmanuel welcomed to Italian soil his 'magnanimous ally.' Queen Victoria poured out her feelings to 'Uncle Leopold.' 'The rashness of the Austrians 'is indeed a *great* misfortune, for it has placed them in the 'wrong. Still there is *one* universal feeling of *anger* at the 'conduct of France, and of great suspicion' (May 3).

Events now moved quickly. Napoleon and Victor Emmanuel went together to the front. On the 4th of June they won a great victory at Magenta; on the 8th, amid scenes of indescribable enthusiasm, they entered Milan; on the 24th they won the double battle of Solferino and San Martino. And then—Napoleon III. stopped short, and sought an armistice from the Austrian Emperor.

This is not the place to canvass Napoleon's motives; our concern is with the policy of the English Government. Between the battles of Magenta and Solferino that Government had changed hands. Lord Palmerston, Mr. Gladstone, and Lord John Russell were now in power. After Solferino Napoleon had the effrontery to request Great Britain to place his terms before Austria as the basis of an armistice. Lord Palmerston, having no mind to act as Napoleon's cat's-paw and draw upon himself the odium of the Italians, somewhat curtly refused. Nevertheless, on the 11th of July the preliminaries of an armistice were arranged at Villafranca.

Upon one aspect of this curious transaction additional light has been recently thrown by the published papers and correspondence of Sir Robert Morier. The motives of Napoleon,

---

* See Letters of Queen Victoria, vol. iii. c. 28, and Martin's 'Prince Consort,' iv. 366, 392.

much canvassed at the time, have now been pretty clearly revealed. Among other things it is established that the military situation after Solferino was less favourable to the victorious allies than has been generally supposed.* But the elucidation of one difficulty creates another. If at Villafranca Napoleon made a virtue of necessity, why did Austria agree to help him out of his difficulties? The political and military situation in Germany supplies the answer to both conundrums. The events of 1859 engendered immense excitement in Germany, and of this excitement Prussia prepared to take advantage.

'Prussia was on the point, at the head of her army and at the head of the German Confederation, to carry the war to France at a moment . . . when the chances were all in our favour. Had we been victorious Prussia would have come out with a heightened position in Germany and in the world at large. It was the task and *will* of Austria to prevent this, and for this purpose the sacrifice even of Lombardy did not seem too great.'†

Count von Moltke, writing to his brother, put the same point more pithily: 'The gist of the thing is that Austria would 'rather give up Lombardy than see Prussia at the head of 'Germany.' But the cession of Lombardy to Piedmont was only one part of the bargain made at Villafranca. The two Emperors proposed the formation, under the presidency of the Pope, of an Italian Confederation, of which Venetia and the Duchies and States of Central Italy were to be component parts. Lord Palmerston did not like the notion, and, what was even more important, the peoples concerned were inflexibly opposed to it. In the spring of 1860 Tuscany, Modena, Parma, and the Roman Legations resolved by plébiscite upon union with Piedmont. It did not become Napoleon III. to question the validity of plébiscites, and he acquiesced in the aggrandisement of his ally; only, however, on condition that Nice and Savoy should be handed over to France in compensation. The cession of these provinces aroused natural but perhaps unreasoning indignation in England; a volunteer force of

* Cf. Thayer, 'Life of Cavour,' ii. 50 *seq.*

† Memorandum of a conversation between the Prince Regent of Prussia (afterwards the Emperor William I.) and the King of Bavaria at Baden, written by the former on the 20th of June 1860. Cf. Morier, i. 235.

130,000 men was rapidly organised, and the Queen scored a point against her ministers by pointing to the perfidy of the 'liberator' of Italy. Events even more stirring were, however, at hand, and interest shifted quickly from the north to the south of the Peninsula.

Early in April 1860 the Sicilians raised the standard of insurrection, and on the 6th of May Garibaldi and his Thousand sailed, under the virtual but unavowed protection of the Italian fleet, from Genoa to Marsala. With incredible rapidity Garibaldi made himself master of the island, and prepared to cross to the mainland.

Would the maritime Powers permit the extension of the Garibaldian enterprise? It was now and during the three critical months which followed that Great Britain rendered incomparable service to the cause of Italian unity. Napoleon implored the English Government to send a combined fleet to obstruct Garibaldi's passage across the Straits. Palmerston and Lord John had no mind to help Napoleon, but they had every desire to assist Cavour. They imagined that Cavour was not less anxious than Napoleon to prevent a Garibaldian invasion of Naples. Cavour had, in fact, over-finessed. To the Powers, which, with the one exception of Great Britain, were suspicious and unfriendly, he had been compelled to take the 'correct' attitude in regard to Garibaldi's unauthorised attack upon a friendly Power. He was, however, genuinely alarmed lest Great Britain should unwittingly assent to Napoleon's proposition. What was he to do?

Mr. George Trevelyan, in the third part of his famous trilogy, has told the whole story with masterly skill: how Cavour consulted Sir James Hudson; how Hudson suggested an unofficial intermediary; how this intermediary, Sir James Lacaita, got access to Lord John Russell and snatched him from the very jaws of Napoleon's emissary (July 24), and how, on the next day, the Cabinet, quite unsuspicious of the influences which had been brought to bear, decided to refuse Napoleon's request.* On the 26th of July the formal but fateful despatch was sent off to Paris, and Napoleon was informed that Her Majesty's Ministers 'were of opinion that

* Trevelyan, 'Garibaldi and the Making of Italy,' p. 104 *seq.* and Appendix A.

'no case had been made out for a departure on their part 'from the general principle of non-intervention,' and that 'the 'Neapolitans ought to be masters either to reject or to receive 'Garibaldi.' Well might the French Government be amazed at this sudden change of front; Lacaita had done his work well.

But Cavour's difficulties were not over, and once more he incurred a heavy debt to Great Britain. Garibaldi's march from Spartivento to Naples was a triumphal progress, and, master of Naples, he announced his intention to annex Rome. At all costs this mad folly must be prevented, and while the King of Naples held Garibaldi in check on the Volturno a Sardinian army was marched into the Romagna. 'Go to Naples,' was Palmerston's advice to Cavour. He went. On the 21st of October Naples and Sicily declared for union with North Italy; on the 26th of October Garibaldi handed over the Southern Kingdom to Victor Emmanuel, and on the 27th of October Lord John Russell indited to Sir James Hudson 'one 'of the most famous despatches in the history of our 'diplomacy.' * Having reviewed the motives which seemed to him to justify the popular rising in the Roman and Neapolitan States he concluded:

'Such having been the causes and concomitant circumstances of the revolution of Italy, Her Majesty's Government can see no sufficient grounds for the severe censure with which Austria, France, Prussia, and Russia have visited the acts of the King of Sardinia. Her Majesty's Government turn their eyes rather to the gratifying prospect of a people building up the edifice of their liberties, and consolidating the work of their independence, amid the sympathies and good wishes of Europe.'†

This despatch caused Russell to be 'blessed night and morning 'by twenty millions of Italians,' but it excited the anger of all the Courts (not excluding our own) in Europe. 'Ce n'est 'pas de la diplomatie,' said Baron Brunnow; 'c'est de la 'polissonnerie.' Diplomacy or not, it effected its purpose. On the 7th of November Garibaldi and Victor Emmanuel entered Naples side by side, and Italy was all but made. The work begun by Napoleon III. was, by a curious irony, completed by his most persistent enemy.

---

* The phrase is Lord Morley's ('Gladstone,' ii. 15).

† Maxwell, 'Clarendon,' ii. 203.

That enemy was, of course, Count Otto von Bismarck. The centre of diplomatic interest now shifts from Italy to Germany. In 1862, Bismarck, after serving a diplomatic apprenticeship at Frankfort, Petersburg, and Paris, was recalled to assume the reins of power at Berlin. The Polish insurrection of 1863 gave him the opportunity of gaining the goodwill of Russia and of gauging the impotence of France and the indifference of England. In Italian affairs the Whig leaders were genuinely interested, and were able to effect a good deal simply by the manifestation of platonic sympathy. In Germany they had to deal with a diplomatist who paid no attention to words unsupported by action.

Words were never wanting to Lord John Russell. Burning with sympathy for oppressed nationalities, he addressed to the Czar a characteristic homily on the subject of Poland, and, for reply, was told to mind his own business. Napoleon would have liked to interfere more forcibly, but was preoccupied with the affairs of Mexico, and contented himself with the suggestion of a Congress. The British Government refused to join him in an invitation * ; the Czar was left to work his will upon the Poles ; Bismarck delighted Alexander by refusing an asylum to Polish refugees, and drew rapid inferences as to the practical value of British homilies.

Upon these inferences he acted when, during the next twelve months, his ambitions brought him into direct conflict with the sympathies, and indeed with the diplomatic engagements, of Great Britain.

The death, in November 1863, of King Frederick VII. of Denmark was the immediate occasion of the conflict. Frederick was not only King of Denmark but Duke of Schleswig and Holstein, and his death raised in an acute form an historic controversy. Into the merits of that controversy it is impossible to enter. Most Englishmen content themselves with the repetition of Lord Palmerston's convenient epigram. The more curious may be referred to an admirable résumé of the whole question from the accomplished pen of Sir Robert Morier.† Here it must suffice to say that Great Britain was

* See a very interesting letter addressed to Lord Clarendon by Queen Sophia of Holland, deploring the refusal of England. Maxwell's 'Clarendon,' ii. 286.

† Op. cit. i. p. 90 *seq.*

primarily responsible for the Treaty of London (1852). Great Britain was herself a party to that treaty, as were Denmark, Russia, France, Prussia, and Austria, but not, be it noted, the Germanic Confederation. The essential point of the treaty was that the Powers recognised the right of Prince Christian of Glücksburg to succeed to the whole of the States united under the sceptre of the Danish King, and specifically based their recognition upon the importance to European peace of 'the maintenance of the integrity of the Danish 'Monarchy.'

Bismarck was not slow to perceive that the integrity of the Danish Monarchy was inconsistent with his ideal of a dominant, or even a powerful, Prussia. To him the Schleswig-Holstein question meant two things: the chance of acquiring for Prussia the great harbour of Kiel, and the opportunity of fastening a quarrel upon Austria and the Germanic *Bund*. With complete unscrupulousness but with consummate adroitness he achieved both ends. Austria foolishly consented to pull the chestnuts out of the fire for him in the Duchies, and then found herself compelled to fight her partner in infamy. The German Diet sided with Austria, and Prussia emerged from the brief conflict mistress of the Duchies, President of a North German Confederation, and the first military Power on the Continent.

At these pregnant events England looked on impotent. Russell, if left to himself, might, perhaps, have sent an English squadron to the Baltic to enforce mediation, and have invited Napoleon to send an army to the Rhine. But Palmerston did not like the idea of a French army on the Rhine. Nor did Queen Victoria. Dynastic influences operated, at this juncture, in divergent directions. On the one hand the daughter of Prince Christian of Glücksburg, by this time King of Denmark, had but lately arrived in England, and the English people had at once taken to their hearts the beautiful bride of the Prince of Wales. On the other hand, the prospects of the Princess Royal of England were sensibly improved by the aggrandisement of Prussia. Nor were these the only interests involved. The Kingdom of Hanover and the Electorate of Hesse, each in its way closely connected with Great Britain, were among the spoils which fell to Prussia after the Seven Weeks' War. Nevertheless, the Queen's attitude throughout these trying

times was consistently 'correct,' and extorted the admiration of Mr. Gladstone.

'Often as I have been struck,' he wrote, 'by the Queen's extraordinary integrity of mind . . . . I never felt it more than on hearing and reading a letter of hers . . . about the Danish question. Her determination in this case, as in others, not inwardly to "sell the truth" overbears all prepossessions and longings, strong as they are, on the German side.'

That the events in Germany, 1863–1867, reacted unfavourably upon English prestige cannot, however, be denied. Thus the late Lord Salisbury wrote in 1864: 'Lord Russell's 'fierce notes and pacific measures furnish an endless theme 'for the taunts of those who would gladly see the influence of 'England in the councils of Europe destroyed.' Lord Salisbury might be suspected of partisan bias. Not so the ripe diplomatist Sir Alexander Malet, the last representative of Great Britain at Frankfort. Reviewing these events in his valuable work on 'The Overthrow of the Germanic Confederation,' published in 1870, Malet affirmed his deliberate opinion that England's 'utter desertion of Denmark lowered her national 'reputation and left a stigma of egotism on the nation' (p. 27).

The worst consequence of British policy at this juncture was the impression conveyed to the mind of Bismarck that, on the Continent, he could work his will with impunity, secure from any interference on the part of Great Britain. The keynote of Russell's diplomacy was a priggish and hectoring tone combined with an unreadiness to employ force in support of convictions. The result was to arouse irritation without compelling respect. The next move in the diplomatic game revealed these consequences only too clearly.

'It is France,' wrote Marshal Randon, 'which has been 'conquered at Sadowa.' 'The French Empire,' says Lord Acton, 'was imperilled as much as the Austrian by the war of '1866.' The 'Seven Weeks' War' was barely ended when Bismarck avowed his belief that it 'lay in the logic of history' that 'a war with France would follow upon the war with 'Austria.' The accuracy of these forecasts was quickly demonstrated. After the dramatic and decisive defeat of Austria, Napoleon could hardly afford to sit still. His own health was failing; his political prestige had been fatally damaged by the Mexican fiasco; things looked black, if not

for his country, at least for his dynasty. Bismarck, meanwhile, had taken an accurate measure of the man. In 1865 he met the Emperor at Biarritz, and by dangling before his eyes the bait of territorial aggrandisement he secured the promise of Venetia for Victor Emmanuel and of French neutrality in the imminent struggle with Austria. In regard to that struggle Napoleon made a prodigious miscalculation. He imagined that the contest between the two great German Powers would be not merely bitter but prolonged, and that when the combatants were mutually exhausted he would be able to step in as mediator. After such a service he would not depart unrewarded. That France must obtain territorial compensation for the recent aggrandisement of the Hohenzollern seems to have become a fixed article of political faith with Napoleon and the statesmen of the ' Liberal Empire '—notably Gramont and Ollivier. And the idea was encouraged by Bismarck himself. Napoleon, therefore, was not without warrant for the belief that when his claims were put forward—perhaps to a Rhine province, perhaps to Luxemburg, perhaps even to Belgium—he would meet with no opposition from Berlin.

Vastly different was the event. Not more than three men in Europe were prepared for the completeness of Prussia's triumph over Austria and the *Bund*. And not even Roon or Moltke or Bismarck was prepared for the rapidity with which it was achieved. Still less was Napoleon. As a result, all his calculations were upset. So far from coming in as an arbitrator, naming his own price for indispensable services, he found himself, after the Treaty of Prague, a humble suitor to Bismarck for some unconsidered trifle. Appear before the Parisian populace empty-handed he dare not. The Rhenish Palatinate might suffice. Having got the suggestion in black and white, Bismarck sent on Napoleon's letter to Bavaria, to whom the Palatinate belonged. Nothing did more to procure the adhesion of Bavaria when the greater conflict opened in 1870. Belgium was the next suggestion, the suggestion being almost certainly stimulated by Bismarck himself. Be this as it may, the suggestion served Bismarck's purpose admirably. On no point were English susceptibilities more acute. Queen Victoria evinced the greatest anxiety on the subject, and wrote to remind Lord Clarendon (January 14 1869) that she had ' invariably expressed the strongest opinion that England was

'bound, not only by the obligations of treaties, but by interests 'of vital importance to herself, to maintain the integrity and 'independence as well as the neutrality of Belgium.' Even Mr. Gladstone was moved to unusual directness of utterance, and insisted to his Foreign Secretary 'That the day when 'this nation seriously suspects France of meaning ill to Belgian 'independence will be the last day of friendship with that 'country, and that then a future will open for which no man 'can answer.' On the 16th of March 1869 Lord Clarendon wrote to Lord Lyons: 'We are very anxious about the Belgian 'business because more or less convinced that the Emperor 'is meaning mischief and intending to establish unfriendly 'relations with Belgium preparatory to ulterior designs.' *

Lord Clarendon held the opinion that the idea of Bismarck egging Napoleon on to an attack on Belgian independence was a mare's-nest. But Clarendon had not the evidence before him. Nevertheless he perceived clearly enough the general tendency of Bismarckian diplomacy. 'A quarrel between 'France and England,' he wrote, 'or even a coolness, is the 'great German desideratum'; and again: 'I believe that 'nothing would be more agreeable to Prussia than that the 'intimacy between the two countries should be disturbed by 'a territorial encroachment which would run on all fours 'with Prussian aggrandisement.'

For the time being Bismarck gave no sign, but just at the appropriate moment, in 1870, he published the Emperor's proposal to the world, and thus completely alienated England's sympathies from France.

There remained only Luxemburg, but Luxemburg was neutralised under European guarantee by the Treaty of London; and, foiled in that quarter also, Napoleon had no alternative but to persuade himself and his people that, after all, Prussia was weakened rather than strengthened by the events of 1866, and that in reality no territorial compensation was due to France.

The events which immediately preceded the outbreak of war between Germany and France may be conveniently followed in the copious correspondence of Lord Lyons.† The

* Newton's 'Lord Lyons,' i. 215.
† I. chs. vi., vii., viii.

latter arrived in Paris as British ambassador in October 1867, and he remained there for twenty years. Almost all his correspondence with Lord Stanley and Lord Clarendon (1867–1870) bears witness to the unrest of the public mind in Paris; to the apprehensions of a *coup de théâtre* on the part of the Emperor, to the rumours of war between France and Prussia. Yet, again and again, Lord Lyons expresses his belief in the pacific intentions of the Emperor. Thus, in March 1868, he writes to Lord Stanley: 'For my own part I am more inclined 'to believe that the Emperor is sincerely anxious to preserve 'peace.' In this belief he was probably right. As to Prussia he was less well informed. In October 1868 he reports conversations of Lord Clarendon with the King and Queen of Prussia and General Moltke.

'The sum of what was said by all three is that Prussia earnestly desires to keep at peace with France; that she will be very careful not to give offence and very slow to take offence; that if a war is brought on she will act so as to make it manifest to Germany and to Europe that France is the unprovoked aggressor; that a war brought on evidently by France would infallibly unite all Germany.'

It is noticeable that Bismarck was not included in the conversations. But if he had been it is likely enough that Lord Clarendon would have carried away from Berlin precisely the same impression, and for the sufficient reason that this was the impression which Bismarck desired to diffuse, and which, as a fact, he did diffuse. Mr. Gladstone himself, writing in this 'Review' in October 1870, gave characteristic expression to the prevailing belief:

'We sorrowfully place upon record,' he wrote, 'the conviction that the whole proceedings of the French Government, in the conduct of its controversy, constituted one series of unrelieved and lamentable errors: errors so palpable and wanton that, when men observe them in the conduct of a Government which rules perhaps the most richly endowed nation in the world, they appear so wholly unaccountable, upon any of the ordinary rules of judgment applicable to human action, that they are almost perforce referred by bewildered observers to blind theories of chance and fate.'

To this opinion it is still, of course, possible to subscribe, even with a fuller knowledge of the facts than Mr. Gladstone possessed in 1870. French diplomacy was indeed inspired

during the years preceding the war by 'a spirit of perverse 'and constant error.' What was imperfectly understood in 1870 was the Machiavellian skill and adroitness with which Bismarck lured the Emperor to his doom. Two distinguished Cambridge scholars—Lord Acton and Dr. Rose—have done more perhaps than anyone else to disclose to the English reading world the secret springs of Bismarck's diplomacy during these fateful years. The King and Queen of Prussia, and even General Moltke, might talk peace to Lord Clarendon at Berlin, but Bismarck was bent on war. He was in no hurry about it; every year strengthened his own position, and relatively weakened that of his opponent. None the less, war with France was essential to his plans: essential to the acquisition of Alsace and Lorraine; essential to the adhesion of the South German States to the North German Confederation; essential to the consolidation of Germany under the hegemony of Prussia. And it was equally essential that France should appear as the aggressor.

That the promotion of the Hohenzollern candidature for the throne of Spain was deliberately designed with this object is no longer questionable. Lord Acton has proved the accusation to the hilt. In 1869 the Spaniards deposed their none too reputable Queen Isabella and declared for a 'constitutional' monarchy. The offer of the throne was in turn declined by Dom Pedro, sometime Prince Consort of Portugal, and by Victor Emmanuel's nephew, the Duke of Genoa. Thereupon Bismarck contrived that the Spanish throne should be offered to Prince Leopold of Hohenzollern-Sigmaringen, a cadet of the Prussian House. Prince Leopold hung back; £50,000 of Prussian bonds found their way to Madrid; * the offer was renewed in 1870, and on the 4th of July was accepted by the Prince.

Events then moved with almost incredible rapidity. It was perfectly well known at Berlin that the acceptance of the Spanish Crown by Prince Leopold would be regarded by France as a *casus belli*, and on the 4th of July Napoleon sent a formal intimation to that effect. Bismarck had now only one obstacle to fear: the straightforward honesty of his own Sovereign. On the 12th of July Prince Leopold withdrew from the candi-

* Acton, 'Historical Essays,' p. 214.

dature ; the Prussian King assented to the withdrawal ; the crisis seemed to have been averted, and Bismarck was left to contemplate the ruins of the diplomatic structure he had so laboriously erected. But again fate was kind to him. There were two persons in France not less eager for war than himself : the Duc de Gramont and the Empress. With inconceivable folly the Duc de Gramont required of the King of Prussia an engagement that under no circumstances would he consent to the revival of the Hohenzollern candidature. This preposterous and provocative demand, presented to him at Ems, was courteously but firmly refused by King William, and Lord Granville, as *amicus curiae*, urged the French Government to withdraw it. But, even had they been willing to do so, it was too late. Bismarck had got his chance, and he did not let it slip. If France wanted war and was mad enough to provoke it, war she should have. Too much has been made of the incident of the Ems telegram. There was neither ' forgery ' nor ' fraud.' The conduct of Gramont in Paris and Benedetti at Ems gave Bismarck a legitimate opportunity, and he turned it to good account. The Emperor still struggled to avert a war for which France was not prepared, but the Empress and Gramont, backed by the Parisian populace, were too strong for him. By a majority of one the Cabinet decided on war (July 14), and on the 19th the declaration reached Berlin.

What part did Great Britain play in the events just narrated ? Without affectation or reservation she declared herself the friend of both parties to the dispute. At Paris she was very ably represented by Lord Lyons, whose correspondence tends rather to confirm than to correct the accepted view of British diplomacy during this period. In October 1868 the French Government virtually requested that Great Britain should ' give advice to Prussia ' on the subject of disarmament. Lord Stanley refused to meddle. Both parties, however, continued to saddle Great Britain with responsibility for the maintenance of peace. Both agreed that England had only to declare that she would join against whichever Power broke the peace. But the real meaning of this was, as Lord Newton insists, ' that at Paris it was expected that England should announce ' beforehand that she would side with France in case of war, ' while at Berlin it meant that she should announce beforehand

'that she would side with Prussia.' * In September 1869 Lord Clarendon used the privilege of an old friend to give good advice to Napoleon. The latter, in reply, suggested that Prussia should make the first move towards disarmament, and in January 1870 Lord Clarendon, at the instance of Count Daru, consented to try to persuade her to do so. 'Perhaps,' he wrote to Lyons, 'we are in as good a position 'as any other Power to make an attempt to bell the cat.' The only practical result was an interesting interchange of views on the general subject of disarmament between Clarendon and Bismarck,† and an extraordinary tribute to the character and influence—if not to the perspicacity—of the English Minister. On the 27th of June 1870 Lord Clarendon died, 'in the very act,' to use Lord Granville's words, 'of trying 'to arrange a matter necessary to civilisation in Europe.' M. Pierre de la Gorce, in his brilliant 'Histoire du Second 'Empire,' has expressed the opinion that Clarendon's death was an irreparable disaster to France. Bismarck meant the same thing when, on meeting Lord Clarendon's daughter, he opened the conversation with the abrupt remark 'Never 'in my life was I more glad to hear of anything than I was 'to hear of your father's death.' Lady Emily Russell showed the surprise she naturally felt, and Bismarck added 'What 'I mean is that, if your father had lived, he would have 'prevented the war.'

We may doubt whether, for once, Bismarck was not more polite than accurate. But this much may be admitted: if Clarendon could not have prevented the war, no one else could. Truly it lay in the logic of history.

The war itself had a sequela, if not a consequence, of high concern to England. That it cost us the friendship of both principals goes without saying. France thought that we might have done more for her before and during the war; Prussia thought that we did too much. And Bismarck's wrath was never impotent. A hint to Russia, and England found herself, in October 1870, confronted by two disagreeable alternatives: either to acquiesce in the denunciation of the Black Sea clauses of the Treaty of Paris, or to fight Russia

---

* Op. cit. i. pp. 246–7.
† Newton, 'Lyons,' i. c. vii.

single-handed. We were not prepared to fight for the neutrality of the Black Sea, and by the Treaty of London (1871) an important section of the Treaty of Paris was torn up.

The Franco-German War closes a chapter in the history of European diplomacy. By that war Bismarck placed the coping-stone upon the two edifices most essentially characteristic of the work of the nineteenth century—a United Germany and a United Italy. It needed only the assault of France to bring Bavaria and the other South German States into line with the North ; a fortnight after the first shot had been fired on the Rhine the last French soldier left Civita Vecchia. ' Better the Prussians in Paris than the Piedmontese in Rome.' So the Empress Eugénie is reported to have said. The dilemma was unreal ; the two dread events were almost simultaneous. In September 1870 the Piedmontese entered Rome ; in January 1871 Paris capitulated to the Germans.

These were tangible events. In a more intangible sense the year 1870–71 seems to close an epoch for Europe and for Great Britain. British diplomacy during the mid-Victorian era was essentially Continental. It is in connexion with European politics that the names of Palmerston, Aberdeen, Stanley, Malmesbury, and Clarendon will be remembered. On world politics they left no impress.* Nor is that remarkable if we recall their attitude towards ' Imperial ' questions. Take, for example, the following sentence from a despatch from Lord Stanley to Lord Lyons (April 4, 1867):

' The Americans, as you will see, have bought a large amount of worthless territory (Alaska) from Russia at a nominal price. Their motive is probably twofold : to establish a sort of claim in the future to British North America, lying as it does between their old and their new possessions ; and to gain a victory over us by doing without our knowledge an act which they probably think will annoy England. In that expectation they will be disappointed, for I cannot find anyone who cares about the matter, and the press in general treats it with indifference.'

---

* Lord John Russell is expressly excluded from this category, for his influence upon the evolution of colonial self-government was pre-eminent, and Palmerston's influence upon the Far East should not be ignored. Nevertheless, the generalisation appears to be sound.

Lord Clarendon was something more than indifferent about our possessions in North America. 'I wish,' he wrote to Lyons (June 1, 1870), 'that they would propose to be independent 'and to annex themselves (i.e. to the U.S.A.). We can't throw 'them off, and it is very desirable that we should part as 'friends.' Two years later 'The Times' advised the Canadians to set up for themselves, 'as the days of their apprenticeship 'were over.' Well might Tennyson ask: 'Is this the voice 'of Empire?'

But the tide of anti-Imperial sentiment was now full ebb. In 1875 Disraeli showed a shrewd appreciation of a rapidly changing situation by his purchase of the Khedive's shares in the Suez Canal. In 1878 he revealed as by a flashlight the potentialities of our Imperial resources by summoning 7000 Indian troops to the Mediterranean. A few months later he virtually annexed Cyprus. The significance of these items was not thalassic but oceanic. Plainly the era of European parochialism was at an end.

Gradually, in Lord Rosebery's phrase, we have exchanged a Foreign for a Colonial policy. Our European neighbours have followed suit. Whether the widening of the diplomatic horizon will hasten or retard the international organisation of peace * is, however, a matter which lies on the knees of the gods. Be that as it may, the diplomatic firmament in which Clarendon, Morier, and Lyons were luminaries has disappeared. If we may not look for a new heaven, at least the old earth has been transfigured.

J. A. R. Marriott.

---

* This is the theme of Mr. Phillips's scholarly monograph, 'The Confederation of Europe.' Cf. p. 1.

THE REFERENDUM AT WORK

1. **Public Opinion and Popular Government.** By A. L. Lowell. Longmans, Green. 1913.
2. **The Initiative, Referendum, and Recall in Switzerland.** By W. E. Rappard. 1912.
3. **Die Resultate des Schweizerischen Referendums.** By Th. Curti. Berne: Wyss. 1911.
4. **Le Referendum.** By Th. Curti, translated by J. Rongat. Paris: Giard et Brière. 1905.

UNTIL a comparatively recent period, in all constitutionally governed states of Europe and of the New World the establishment of parliaments directly elected by universal suffrage was regarded as the final goal of democracy. To-day in almost every country it is obvious that this point of view is out of date. Experience of parliamentary institutions has revealed defects previously unsuspected, and to-day the people are complaining of their parliaments almost as bitterly as in earlier centuries they complained of despotic Sovereigns. In the New World—in British colonies as well as in the United States—the people have turned back instinctively to the form of government that existed among men long before representative institutions were devised—the direct government of the people by themselves—and have tried to devise means by which this principle of direct popular government can be adapted to the complex conditions of modern life. It is therefore worth while to give in some detail an account of the practical working of the Swiss Referendum.

Switzerland is inhabited by three distinct races, and its population speaks four languages: for to German, French, and Italian must be added Romanche—a language spoken in the Engadine and several other valleys of the Grisons. The population is further divided by religious differences, which have in the past given rise to bitter antagonisms. There are also striking social and industrial contrasts; the manufacturing population of Zurich is separated only by a few leagues from the mountaineers of central Switzerland. To

conciliate all these antagonisms, to harmonise these discords in a national unity, is eminently the problem of government in Switzerland.

And a difficult problem it is !—so difficult that more than one government has failed to solve it; and Switzerland would on many occasions have committed fundamental, perhaps irreparable, errors, but for the direct intervention of the people in federal legislation.

Let us take first the question of military reform. After the Franco-German War of 1870–71 the defects revealed by the mobilisation of the Swiss army for the defence of Swiss neutrality made it necessary that the military organisation of the Confederation should be reshaped. The centralist party, dreaming in those days of a unified Switzerland, seized the opportunity to demand a complete revision of the constitution of 1848. The programme of this revison was 'one 'law, one army.' This programme was ratified by a parliamentary majority, and found its expression in the scheme of a constitution submitted in 1872 to the vote of the people.

But the programme had gone beyond the aim to be attained. In unifying the Swiss law, in depriving the cantons—historic organs of local autonomy—of the military powers they had previously held, the proposed constitution of 1872 inflicted deep injury on the traditional feelings of Catholic and French-speaking Switzerland. The deputies of these districts had been in a minority in Parliament, but they had their triumph on the appeal to the people. The centralist scheme of 1872 was rejected by the electors by a majority of 260,859 votes against 255,606, and by thirteen cantons against nine.

Profiting by this experience, Parliament started working anew, and in 1874 elaborated another plan in which the most urgent reforms in the departments of law and the army were realised, but without seriously infringing the rights of the cantons. This new scheme of military and legal reform also included a constitutional reform, which had indeed formed part of the proposals of 1872—namely, the '*referendum facultatif*.' Up to this period, the Swiss constitution only made provision for an obligatory referendum to apply in all cases of proposed changes in the constitution, but only in such cases. The scheme of 1874 gave to the people the right to demand—by means of a petition, signed by not less than 30,000 electors—

a referendum on any Bill that has passed through Parliament. This whole scheme of legal, military, and constitutional reform was ratified by 340,000 votes to 198,000, and became the constitution of 1874.

The application of the scheme of 1872 would certainly have upset the balance between the central power and local autonomy. It would in consequence have opened for Switzerland a period of sectional struggles which would have been injurious to the harmonious development of the country. Switzerland owes the avoidance of these struggles to the introduction of the direct vote of the people. This vote, however, in no way prevented the necessary military reforms, and the military reorganisation, voted in 1874, enabled the Government to remedy the chief defects pointed out by General Herzog in his Report on the mobilisation of the Swiss army in 1870–71.

Twenty years later, the centralists made a new attempt at military unification, which was again rejected on a referendum. In 1907 the question of military reform was once more raised; but Parliament, in the scheme then proposed, respected the powers of local authorities and aimed only at the improvement of the army, without any underlying political idea. This scheme the people accepted by 329,900 votes to 267,000, although it imposed considerable financial sacrifices on the country and heavy personal sacrifices on each citizen.

Thus the history of the different polls of the Swiss people on the military question proves that the nation has willingly accepted material sacrifices required for the defence of the country and for national integrity. It has, however, refused to let the central power suppress entirely the functions of local authorities. In so acting the people have shown an acute political sense and have usefully amended the decisions arrived at by a parliamentary majority.

A similar influence has been exercised by the direct vote of the people in the sphere of education. If there is one delicate subject in a country inhabited by several races, speaking several languages, divided between several religious beliefs, it is that of education. There is no other question on which racial and religious passions can be more easily provoked. Observation of what happens in certain parts of Austria, and

both in Russian and Prussian Poland, furnishes sufficient proof of this statement. In the peaceable settlement of these difficulties the Helvetic Confederation has been wonderfully served by its decentralised institutions and its traditions of local liberty.

Though the whole population of Switzerland is divided into three races, each of these three races is to a large extent localised in certain cantons or groups of cantons. In the centre, the north, and north-east of Switzerland, German is spoken; French in the west and south-west; Italian in the south. There are very few cantons in which two languages are strongly represented, though this is the case in the canton Berne, where local disputes occasionally occur.

There is a similar localisation of religious beliefs. Take for instance the cantons of western Switzerland: Vaud and Neuchatel are almost exclusively Protestant; Fribourg and Valais nearly all Roman Catholic; Geneva alone is mixed, since 1815, and, accordingly, it is in Geneva that in the second half of the nineteenth century the most violent religious dissensions took place.

This relative localisation of races and religions—which, however, tends to diminish nowadays through the general movement from the country to the towns—has made it much easier to solve the problem of education. From the earliest times, the cantons have had the direction of public instruction. Most of them have even left a large autonomy to the parishes, thus allowing for a still greater decentralisation. And as the parishes have till now generally enjoyed almost complete racial and religious unity, each has been able to organise its schools with perfect freedom of action. Many irritating problems have consequently in the main been avoided in Switzerland. The school system has worked peacefully and has granted to the people a satisfactory system of education which has been highly praised by competent judges.

For a long time the Confederation did not even try to intervene in the organisation of education, merely insisting, by clauses contained in the constitution, on the principle of compulsory and gratuitous primary instruction, and on the obligation of respecting in the schools the convictions of adherents to all religious beliefs. Apart from these general reservations, each canton remained free to organise, in its

own way, the education of the young. In 1882, however, the centralist party, whose attempts to deal with legal and military reform have already been mentioned, tried to transfer the control of primary education to the Central Government.

The attempt was made with much skill in the shape of a Bill creating, in the Department of the Interior, a new post of Secretary of Instruction, whose duties were to superintend the application of the general principles formulated by the constitution and to collect statistics. But behind this apparently harmless proposal, there lay a whole scheme for the intervention of the central government in the superintendence and control of schools. The real object of the authors of this programme was to impose uniform rules for secular as well as for religious teaching.

The publication of this programme—which was meant to remain secret provisionally, but was revealed through an indiscretion—raised great excitement throughout Switzerland. The opposition was particularly strong among the Roman Catholics, who apprehended interference in the religious teaching given to their children. At the same time the French-speaking cantons feared lest educational methods contrary to their traditions should be employed. Protestant-Conservative centres of German Switzerland also showed themselves hostile to the scheme. The referendum was demanded by more than 180,000 citizens, the highest number ever attained in Switzerland. At the popular vote of the 26th of November 1882, the proposed election of a Secretary of Instruction (who was popularly known as ' school bailiff '—*schulvogt*—in memory of the Austrian bailiffs who governed the cantons of central Switzerland in the thirteenth century) was rejected by 318,000 to 172,000 votes.

Since that day—a red-letter day in the political history of modern Switzerland—the centralist party has given up the idea of interference in the matter of primary schools. Under the control of the cantons and parishes, these schools have continued to develop satisfactorily, and local authorities have shown themselves fully competent for their task. As a proof, it may be mentioned that Switzerland is one of the countries of the world where education is the most widely spread and where the proportion of illiterates is smallest.

Twenty years later, in 1902, the people accepted the financial

help of the central government for primary schools, as had already been done for professional, commercial, agricultural, and artistic instruction. But this financial support of the Confederation was only sanctioned by the electors under the express condition, set down anew in the constitution, that the organisation, management, and superintendence of primary schools should remain under local control.

Up to the present day the only educational institution which has been founded and is directed exclusively by the Central Government is the High Polytechnic school of Zurich. All other schools of every degree, from village primary schools to the universities, are managed by the cantons and parishes or by private teachers, and consequently correspond to the intellectual and religious needs, and to the historical traditions, of all the different racial and religious groups of Switzerland.

On this question, too, the referendum has preserved local autonomy against the attempts of a parliamentary majority to extend the authority of the Central Government.

As economic and social questions to-day occupy in most States a more important position than merely political questions, it is interesting to examine in what way the popular masses deal with these problems. In countries where there is no direct democratic control, many people fear lest this direct intervention of the people through the referendum and the Initiative should favour subversive legislation, disastrous to public finance and to the teaching of political economy. Elsewhere, the opposite objection has been formulated, and the referendum has been represented as a weapon for obstruction and a hindrance to all economic and social progress. The latter criticism has been frequently expressed in Germany, especially since the vote of 1900 on social insurance, to which reference will presently be made.

It can be proved, however, by a few precise examples, that neither of these mutually destructive opinions is well founded. The first social law on which the Swiss people were called upon to express their opinion was the Factory Law of 1877. At the time when the measure was framed it was considered very daring and advanced. It established a maximum of eleven hours for the day's work not only for women and young people, but also for adult workmen. Work on Sundays and by night

was forbidden, except in certain strictly defined cases, and other strict regulations were made for women's and children's work.

These and other proposals roused much opposition on the part of manufacturers, who contended that such severe laws would prove a fatal blow to Swiss industry. The Bill was also opposed by Liberal partisans of the *laissez-faire* policy. In spite of this opposition, the Bill passed through Parliament, and with the vigorous support of the Radical governmental party, backed by the workmen and the Conservative Catholics, was accepted by the people in 1877 by a small majority of 10,000 on a poll of 350,000 voters.

The apprehensions of manufacturers and of the *laissez-faire* school have happily not been realised. During the last forty years the idea of factory protection for workmen has spread all over the world and has even been made the subject of international conventions. Quite recently, a general revision of the law of 1877, accomplished this time with the agreement of all parties, has replaced the maximum of eleven hours' work by ten hours, and has strengthened the protective measures for women and young people.

The problem of insurance for workmen against accident, sickness, invalidity, and old age has been dealt with by the Swiss referendum on several occasions.

As early as 1890 the people accepted by 283,000 votes to 92,000 and by 20½ cantons to 1½ an amendment imposing upon the Federal Government the obligation of preparing legislation for insurance against sickness and accident. All the details of application were left to the legislature. The first plan was elaborated by a lawyer well acquainted with social questions, M. Forrer, then member of Parliament and to-day member of the Federal Government. His scheme was imposing as a whole, but it had the defect of not being based sufficiently on the local and liberal traditions of Switzerland. M. Forrer, following too closely the example of Germany, whose example has had much influence on other countries, decided that insurance should be obligatory not only against accidents occurring in the course of employment, but also against sickness. Further, the insurance was to be organised by the State itself. It was only with difficulty that the existing benefit societies obtained the right to keep a small, insufficient place in the vast

unitary edifice of which the Bill brought forward in 1899 laid the foundations.

In spite of its defects, this plan with a few amendments concerning details was voted by both Houses almost unanimously. Out of the whole Swiss Parliament there was only one member, M. Édouard Odier, Liberal-Conservative member for Geneva, now Swiss minister plenipotentiary in St. Petersburg, who dared to vote against the Bill, so great was the influence exercised by the author of the Bill over Parliament, and so great was the desire of all parties not to risk the reproach of having opposed such an important social reform.

This agreement between the representatives of all parties made it extremely difficult to organise the referendum. Three opposition journalists, however, set to work energetically. They formed a committee and had the satisfaction of collecting 118,000 signatures (instead of 30,000 as required by the constitution). The law was then submitted to the popular verdict. On the 20th of May 1900 the scheme that had been accepted by all members of Parliament, save one, was rejected by the people by a majority of nearly 200,000 votes.

The principal reason for this rejection was that the proposed law was too bureaucratic, too centralised, that it extended too greatly the power of the State and threatened the spontaneous efforts of private initiative. The opposition came chiefly from the benefit societies, which had till then been the principal promoters of insurance in Switzerland, and felt themselves endangered by the official scheme.

This vote has become a classical instance of the fundamental disagreement that can exist between the people and their representatives. The disagreement was further emphasised by the curious accident that M. Odier, the only deputy who had voted against the Bill, lost his seat at the general election of October 1899, which took place between the passage of the Bill through Parliament and its rejection by the people. This election was fought on questions quite remote from insurance, yet its results taken by themselves would certainly have created the impression that the Insurance Act was popular, an impression which the referendum proved to be diametrically contrary to the truth. Without the referendum it would have been impossible to ascertain the opinion of electors on this important issue.

This Swiss vote on the Insurance Question was at the time much commented upon in foreign countries, especially in Germany. The adversaries of democracy exulted. 'See now,' they exclaimed, 'the superiority of the monarchic over the democratic principle! The German monarchy has solved in a few years the problem of social insurance which the Swiss democracy, although it pretends to be so advanced, has been incapable of solving.' This argument, plausible as it may have appeared at first sight, was none the less false. Those who used it forgot one thing: that the authors of the Forrer scheme had been far too much inspired by the example of Germany instead of conforming more closely to the liberal and decentralised traditions of Switzerland, which a Swiss statesman cannot forget without running the greatest risks.

As a matter of fact, the negative vote of 1900 by no means put an end to the problem of insurance in Switzerland. The adversaries of M. Forrer's plan were not hostile to all schemes of national insurance. They declared, on the contrary, that they desired another and a better one.

After a few years the Government and Parliament got to work again and a new Bill was evolved. It represented a compromise between the two tendencies. The insurance against accident remained centralised and monopolised in the hands of a State department. But insurance against sickness was left in the hands of voluntary associations, which received a subvention from the Federal Government on fulfilling certain conditions.

These concessions disarmed most of the opponents of the scheme which had been rejected in 1900. The referendum was again asked for, but at the vote that took place on the 4th of February 1912, the new measure was accepted by the people by a majority of about 50,000 votes.

If we ask ourselves what has been the influence of the referendum on the insurance legislation in Switzerland, we must acknowledge that it delayed the solution of the problem for about twelve years. It has, however, substituted for a centralised law inspired by foreign legislation and contrary to Swiss national traditions, a law conforming to these traditions, and utilising the enthusiasm of the first pioneers of insurance instead of shutting them out in order to make room for more State officials. The original scheme was so

complicated and so unpopular that its application would hardly have been possible. In rejecting it, the Swiss people rendered a service not only to the cause of their own freedom and traditions, but also to the cause of national insurance itself.

In this instance, as in many others, the referendum has proved that it is not a mere instrument of obstruction and negation, but that, just because it expresses the real opinion of the sovereign people, it exercises on legislation a positive and a beneficial influence.

The same conclusion is reached when we examine the action of the Swiss people in an economic question which was very important for the credit of the country, but extremely difficult to solve—namely, the creation of a central bank of issue. Switzerland for a long time lived under the system of a multiplicity of banks of issue. Every canton, nearly every town, possessed one. Each bank could issue bank-notes subject to the provisions of the Federal Law relating to the metallic reserve, and subject to the inspection of federal overseers. About 1890 there existed no fewer than thirty-five banks of issue in Switzerland. In spite of federal control, and in spite of an agreement concluded between the principal credit houses for the establishment of a uniform type of bank-note and the fixing of a normal rate of discount, this great multiplicity of banks of issue was the cause of much inconvenience to the country and injuriously affected the currency of Swiss bank-notes in foreign countries. Business men complained, and urged the creation of a central bank.

In 1891 the Government and Parliament submitted to the people a new constitutional amendment, bestowing on the Federal Government the monopoly of issuing bank-notes. This proposal was accepted by the people, by 231,000 to 158,000, in spite of their passion for local autonomy, because they recognised that in the general interest of the country it was desirable to centralise the issue of bank-notes.

There remained the question of how to give practical application to the principle adopted. There was an open choice between two solutions. The Federal Government could either administer the monopoly of bank-notes directly by means of a State bank, or could hand over its authority to a central joint-stock bank, working with and under the control

of the Government. When the time came to draft the necessary statute, a violent struggle arose between the partisans of the State bank and those of the joint-stock bank. The Radical-Étatiste school, supported by the Socialists, was in favour of a State bank ; the leaders of commerce and industry were in favour of a joint-stock bank, removed from every political influence and administered on purely commercial principles. Their demand was supported both by Liberals and Conservatives, for neither party wished the State bank to become a political weapon in the hands of the Government.

There was a difference of opinion in the Government itself ; and by four votes to three the Cabinet finally decided for the State bank. Parliament followed the Cabinet, and, after long debates the Bill for creating a State bank was passed by a small majority.

Thus beaten in the Cabinet and beaten in Parliament the opponents of the State bank appealed to the people. They asked for a referendum and secured nearly 80,000 signatures. In the campaign that followed, they laid before the electors the political and economic arguments against a State bank ; they pointed to the confusion which would inevitably arise between the credit of the Confederation and the credit of the bank ; they argued that in time of war a State bank would create risks to the nation which would not be created by a private bank ; they also appealed to the lessons of history, and quoted the example of other countries which had entrusted the monopoly of issuing bank-notes to an independent bank.

On the other hand, the partisans of the State bank organised a campaign of a more or less demagogic character. They dangled before the eyes of electors the illusive prospect of great profits which they declared the State bank would realise. They demanded that these profits should be withheld from the greed of private shareholders, and added to the funds of the State to be used in carrying out various social reforms, on which much emphasis was laid.

Curious and significant fact ! These arguments which had determined the vote of the majority in Parliament had little effect on the people, and by 255,000 votes against 195,000 the electors rejected the Bill. Thus, on an extremely complicated question, sound doctrines of political economy—strengthened it is true by the anti-centralising instincts of the

people—found more support among the masses than in the Cabinet and Parliament.

The hostile vote of the people compelled the Cabinet and Parliament to prepare a new plan. In 1905 a law was passed creating a central joint-stock bank, working under the control of the Federal Government, but with an independent board of directors and separate financial responsibility. The referendum was not even asked for against this Act, which thus received the tacit approbation of the people. The National Swiss Bank was opened in 1907. Created by the Swiss people, administered by competent directors, free from any local political influence, it has rendered to the Swiss public and to Swiss commerce the services they expected.

Many more examples could be given; but the preceding statements, founded on official figures and facts, will perhaps be sufficient to prove that the referendum has not acted in Switzerland as an instrument of obstruction, and has not paralysed political, economic, or social progress. The people, on the contrary, have clearly discerned the difference between measures conforming to the general interest of the country and its national traditions, and measures inspired by false political conceptions and threatening the nation's freedom.

A word must be said about the Initiative—namely, the right which 50,000 electors possess of presenting to the people without the intervention of Parliament a measure for amending the constitution. In dealing with measures so presented to them, the electors have shown as much independence and critical sense as in dealing with measures passed by Parliament. One instance will suffice. In 1894, 52,000 citizens asked that the Socialist conception of the right to work (*droit au travail*) should be incorporated in the federal constitution. This proposal, submitted by means of the Initiative, was rejected by the overwhelming majority of 308,000 to 75,000 votes. Each canton gave a negative majority.

Returning to the referendum, the following statistics are not without interest. From 1874, when the right to demand a referendum by petition of 30,000 electors was established, down to the end of 1913—i.e. in the space of forty years—the Federal Parliament has passed 286 measures on which the people might have claimed a referendum. They have only done so on 31 occasions—i.e. in the proportion of 1 to 9. Of

these 31 bills which were submitted to the vote of the people, 12 were accepted and 19 rejected. Thus the referendum has caused the rejection of only 1 out of 15 measures passed by Parliament. Such a use of the referendum cannot with any honesty be described as obstructive. But the mere existence of the referendum has undoubtedly helped to prevent the introduction of measures dangerous to the welfare of Switzerland, and has enabled the people to exercise a salutary influence upon the legislative work of their representatives.

A brilliant French writer, M. Émile Faguet, published a few years ago a very amusing little volume in which he identified democracy with the worship of incompetence. We will not discuss here the whole problem of democracy. But, on comparing direct democracy with the parliamentary system, the experience of Switzerland certainly shows that the people are often less inclined than their representatives to worship incompetence. The explanation of this paradox probably is that competent men and specialists on every matter are always to be found in the nation and can always get a hearing from the nation; but in Parliament, the people who command the most influence are professional politicians, chosen by party caucuses, and in many cases ignorant of everything except the art of wire-pulling.

One quite recent instance proves the readiness of the Swiss democracy to appreciate competent authority. When it was necessary, some years ago, to unify the civil law for the whole of Switzerland and to draw up a code which was to be the expression of the juridical conceptions of all parts of the nation, and to revise the codes then in force in the twenty-five cantons and half-cantons, the Government appealed to the best qualified man in Switzerland—Dr. Huber, professor of civil law at the University of Berne. After several years of study, Dr. Huber drew up his plan, which was submitted to a commission of experts and to the Cabinet. When it was ready for parliamentary discussion the town of Berne spontaneously offered to Professor Huber a seat in the National Council, so that this learned jurist might be able himself to defend his proposals in Parliament. The new code was adopted with hardly any modifications, and although it introduced considerable innovations, the people, respecting the great authority of its

author, abstained from asking for the referendum, and in this way expressed their tacit approbation.

The scientific value of this new civil code has been recognised by German jurists, who cannot be suspected of complacency towards Swiss democracy.

The referendum, therefore, is not—as some professedly intellectual Radicals imagine—an instrument of reaction or barbarism, systematically hostile to everything that proceeds from 'superior persons.' Even in the case of the Initiative, the committees which put forward new schemes always try, before submitting them to the people, to obtain the advice of competent jurists. As an example, the committee which recently wanted to obtain through the Initiative the complete prohibition of games of chance in Switzerland engaged a professor of jurisprudence at the University of Berne to draw up the proposed constitutional amendment. Last year another committee, wishing to propose that international treaties should henceforth be submitted for ratification to the referendum, had the text of their proposal drawn up by a professor of international law at the University of Lausanne.

The present writer naturally does not pretend to assert that the sovereign people is infallible. The complete history of the referendum in Switzerland provides instances in which impartial critics would admit that the majority had blundered. It must, moreover, be admitted as a general proposition that the electorate tends to be too parsimonious in the matter of public expenditure. The electors—particularly in the country districts—are reluctant to sanction any new taxes, or any augmentation of public charges, unless their necessity has been definitely proved. This consideration only applies to Bills involving new forms of expenditure or new forms of taxation. The ordinary annual budgets of the Swiss Confederation and of the Swiss cantons are not submitted to the referendum. But this cautious attitude on the part of electors is by no means altogether an evil. In all countries, members of Parliament are ready to vote for large expenditure which will contribute to increase their popularity and to assure their re-election. The simple citizen does not have to worry about elections. For him the argument of re-election, the parasite of all budgets, does not exist. Thus the people often act as excellent allies to

the finance minister, helping him to defend public funds against the rapacity of members of Parliament.

The anonymous author of the remarkable article published last October in the 'Edinburgh Review' insisted with much reason on the fact that it is to the referendum that Switzerland owes the exceptional stability of her Government. For the people need not change their Parliament or their Cabinet in order to obtain the rejection of any particular Bill. The referendum supplies the necessary means of control. And when the people are dissatisfied—which happens in Switzerland as elsewhere—their opposition is not directed against the men who have passed the Bills, but against the Bills themselves. This is what inspired Marc Monnier, a talented French writer who lived long in Geneva, to say that 'the Swiss people disowns its deputies 'and then re-elects them.'

But enough has been said to explain why it is that the Swiss nation, after forty years of experience of direct democracy, is increasingly attached to the institutions which render possible the real government of the people by themselves.

HORACE MICHELI.

Geneva, June 1914.

SERVIA IRREDENTA

1. **The Hapsburg Monarchy.** By HENRY WICKHAM STEED. Constable. New Edition. 1914.
2. **The Servian People : their Past Glory and their Destiny.** By PRINCE LAZAROVICH-HREBELIANOVICH. Werner Laurie. 1910.
3. **L'Europe et la Question d'Autriche au Seuil du Vingtième Siècle.** By ANDRÉ CHÉRADAME. Paris. 1901.

THE assassination of the heir to the Austrian throne by a young Servian, in the avowed belief that he was by that act advancing the cause of the Servian people, shows how far Europe still is—and perhaps always will be—from a settlement of the many racial problems that perplex statesmen and estrange peoples. Yet during the past fifty years Europe has been thinking, with little intermission, of racial problems, and it may almost be said that the dominant fact of the latter half of the nineteenth century is the emergence of new nationalities based upon racial self-consciousness.

The settlement arrived at after Waterloo delivered the major nations from the short-lived domination of Napoleon ; but it was a settlement conceived in the interest of dynasties rather than peoples, and it parcelled out as much of Europe as the negotiators could bring within their purview without regard to the wishes of the inhabitants. Government, it was held, was the business of the Great Powers, with their hereditary rulers and their elaborately organised bureaucracies ; peoples were merely so much material to be governed. Exceptions had to be admitted—notably in the case of Switzerland—where the peoples were compact and prepared to fight for their old traditions of independence ; but the general idea of the settlement was to divide Europe—as much of Europe, that is to say, as was not under the dominion of the Turks—into prefectures of police under the central control of the Holy Alliance. That meant, of course, in central Europe, which alone concerns us here, the delimitation of the several spheres of influence of Russia, Prussia, and Austria : a delimitation

which took no cognizance whatsoever of the national sentiments of such peoples as Hungarians, Italians, Czechs, Ruthenians, Roumanians, Poles, and Servians.

Such were the conditions in which the new era was inaugurated; and the subsequent history of the epoch has been, in the main, the history of the conflict of two tendencies. On the one hand we have seen the three Great Powers involved aiming, often in bitter rivalry with one another, at consolidation and expansion; on the other hand we have seen the minor nationalities which the settlement ignored growing up to racial manhood, developing their racial individualities, and maintaining their racial rights. In the period under review, Prussia has conquered the hegemony of the German Empire, and acquired fresh territory from the French and the Danes. Russia, during the same period, has acquired Bessarabia and destroyed the constitution of Finland; Austria has annexed Bosnia.

That is one side of the picture; and the great peril to European peace is commonly assumed to lie in the further pursuit of the ambitions which it exhibits. Germany, we are warned, has designs upon Denmark, Holland, Belgian Flanders, and the German-speaking cantons of Switzerland; Russia, apart from her Asiatic ambitions, has an eye upon the ice-free harbours of Norway; Austria sees her future in the Balkans, to which she hopes to obtain access by way of Albania. All that may be true; but it is by no means the whole of the truth; and political predictions based upon it will probably prove to be erroneous. There is another side to the picture which shows us quite different forces at work: that rise of the younger, self-assertive nationalities which has proceeded *pari pasu* with the aggrandisement of the Powers in whose dominions they have found themselves reluctantly incorporated.

The fortunes of Russia, in this connexion, do not concern us, though the unexpected vigour of the Bulgarian nationality—hardly known to exist half a century ago—has, for the time being, barred Russian progress, once supposed to be inevitable, towards Constantinople. The fortunes of Germany only concern us indirectly, though it is to be noted that wherever German authority has been extended over other nationalities—in Prussian Poland and Schleswig-Holstein, not less than in Alsace—there is an open sore. The

fortunes of Austria, to which we must try to confine ourselves, have been the stormiest of all. There, in 1815, the situation was that of a Teuton bureaucracy ruling over a hotch-potch of races, assumed to be the natural inferiors of the controlling race ; and the subsequent history of the country has shown us those inferior races denying their inferiority at the top of their voices, and trying—sometimes successfully and sometimes unsuccessfully—to kick over the traces.

First came the triumph of the Italians of Lombardy and Venetia. In 1815, and for many years afterwards, the ruling Austrian caste took a purely contemptuous view of these Italians, calling them ' mongrels '—a medley of Gauls, Celts, Goths, Germans, Greeks, Normans, and Arabs—and believing them to be equally incapable of unity and self-government. Hübner wrote of them in that strain—sparing them no disdainful epithet—as late as 1848, concluding his tirade with the words ' I cannot believe in a United Italy ' ; but, only eleven years later, the union of Italy was an accomplished fact. The Austrians had to give up Lombardy in 1859, and Venetia in 1866 ; and now the Kingdom of Italy is a Power of equal rank with Austria, maintaining, and occasionally pressing, its claim to the small residue of Italia Irredenta which Austria still possesses.

Next, in 1867, came the turn of the Hungarians. They had been bloodily repressed when they rose in rebellion in 1849 ; but now—after Sadowa—the instinct of self-preservation required Austria to make friends with them. Francis Joseph sent for Francis Deák, and asked him what Hungary wanted ; and the answer was that Hungary wanted ' her rights.' ' Very well, Deák,' replied the Emperor, after reflection, ' I suppose it must be as you insist ' ; and then he and the Hungarian leaders negotiated the terms of the Ausgleich, whereby Hungary was taken into partnership with Austria and empowered, broadly speaking, to Magyarise one half of the Empire, while the Austrians were Germanising the other half.

It was a concession of great importance, and it saved the situation for the moment. The Hungarians—always excepting a few extremists who could neither forget nor forgive the cruelties of the repression of 1849—were willing enough to go into partnership with the Austrians, because there was not, except in such a partnership, any satisfactory future for their

race. Between Austria and Russia, they were between the devil and the deep sea ; and they got better terms from Austria than they could have obtained elsewhere. The partnership, therefore, still persists, not exactly as a union of hearts, but as an alliance which it does not suit the purposes of either ally to dissolve. At the same time, however, it only solved a portion of the racial problem of the Empire ; and the portion of the problem which it left unsolved was quickly formulated by the Slav historian Palacky :

' If it is decided,' Palacky wrote, ' to reverse the natural policy of Austria ; if this Empire, composed of a medley of different nationalities, refuses to accord equal rights to all, and organises the supremacy of certain races over the others ; if the Slavs are to be treated as an inferior people, and handed over to two dominant peoples as mere material to be governed by them ; then Nature will assert herself and resume her rights. An inflexible resistance will transform hope into despair, and a peaceful into a warlike spirit ; and there will be a series of conflicts and struggles of which it will be impossible to foresee the end. We Slavs existed before Austria ; and we shall continue to exist after Austria has disappeared.'

The immediate occasion of that outburst was the Emperor's refusal to accede to the demand that he should constitute a separate Kingdom of Bohemia : a request which the Magyars would not have allowed him to grant if he had desired to do so. As a menace it amounted to nothing ; for the Bohemians had not, like the Italians, any *point d'appui* outside their borders, and were not, like the Hungarians in 1849, strong enough to challenge the central authority. As a prediction, however, it indicated the essential weakness of the Austrian Empire—now become the Dual Monarchy—and the growing forces which were thenceforward to threaten to tear it to pieces. The potency of these forces, the play of which will determine the future of Austria-Hungary, depends upon three facts which we may tabulate :

1. The German and Magyar characters.
2. The Slav character.
3. The relations subsisting between the Austrian Slavs and the independent Slav kingdoms.

One may permit oneself to speak of the German character the more frankly because there is much to be admired in it.

The Germans are at least as efficient as they are unsympathetic. At the same time, it is no exaggeration to say that their unpopularity accounts for much of the prevalent European unrest. All over central Europe, from the Baltic to the Adriatic, we find Germans ruling over miscellaneous peoples—'mere material,' from their point of view, 'to be 'governed by them'—who cordially dislike them; and this condition of things has now existed long enough to demonstrate their constitutional incapacity for making the undeniable material benefits of their rule acceptable to their subjects.

The merits of the German, whether of the North or of the South, are mainly of a military and bureaucratic order. He can subdue, and he can organise; but he can neither conciliate his alien subjects nor absorb them. Regarding himself as a heaven-sent governor of men, he can, in fact, only govern in a state of siege. That is how he differs from his rival, the Frenchman; and the modern history of Europe bristles with illustrations of the difference. The territory which the French have taken over from their neighbours—Roussillon, Nice, Savoy—has become contentedly and loyally French; one never hears of 'incidents' in these provinces. On the other hand, the history of German rule in alien territory is an almost unbroken series of incidents; the world never has time to forget one incident before another occurs.

The Zabern riots; the refusal to allow the explorer Amundsen to lecture in the Danish language in Schleswig-Holstein; the attempt to expropriate the Polish land-owners in Posnania—these are a few typical instances of the constant friction in the North. Austrian history abounds with examples of similar friction in the South. The constant free fights in the various Austrian Parliaments; the suspension of constitutional guarantees in Croatia because the Croats were showing an inconvenient sympathy with Servian ambitions; the dismissal of the Italian employees of the Trieste municipality:—these are the most recent facts which it is possible to put in evidence. But the most eloquent fact of all is to be found in the state of the poll when a *plébiscite* was taken in Venetia to ascertain 'the wishes of the population' with regard to the proposal that the province should be severed from Austria. The figures then were:—

For severance	640,000
Against	40
Majority for	639,960

Teuton domination, that is to say, even when beneficial, is always regarded as odious; and Magyar domination is no more favourably viewed. Magyars and Austrians agree in esteeming themselves the natural superiors of the other miscellaneous races which compose the Dual Monarchy; and those miscellaneous races find common ground in disputing that doctrine with passionate vehemence. Thus the sore, as has been said, is kept open, and the situation is provided with a permanent emotional factor—a centrifugal force of which the political prophet must never lose sight, even though he feels that the centripetal tendencies are, at the given moment, strong enough to counteract it. A common devotion to the Emperor Francis Joseph as an amiable and unhappy old man who has endured more than his share of human sorrow may or may not be the principal unifying element in the problem; his death is bound, in the course of nature, to settle that point before very long. Meanwhile we must note that most, though not all, of the races which resent German and Magyar hegemony are Slav races, and must consider how the peculiarities of the Slav character affect the problem.

In many respects the Slavs are obviously the inferiors of the Germans and the Magyars. They are less civilised, less efficient, and less masterful; they have not yet acquired the German talent for organised administration. But, on the other hand, however they may compare with the Magyars, they are more prolific than the Germans, and, at the same time, far more tenacious of their language, their traditions, and their general racial characteristics. The German, strongly marked as his characteristics appear to be in Germany, is a man who adapts himself to a new environment in the twinkling of an eye. In England he becomes English; in America he becomes American; in Alsace he used, in the old days, to become French; while it is a subject of national lamentation that at the present time he is apt, in Prussian Poland, to become a Pole. The Slav, on the contrary, in spite of all endeavours to force a foreign culture upon him, remains a Slav as pertinaciously as the Jew remains a Jew. *La Russie ne bouge pas, elle se*

recueille, is a famous saying which expresses this trait, though not specifically intended to express it. The same characteristic is expressed still more faithfully in the saying, hardly less famous : ' Imprison a Slav idea in the deepest dungeon of ' a fortress, and it will blow up the fortress in order to get out.'

The history of central Europe during the last hundred years has been largely the history of the escape of Slav ideas from durance. They have escaped from it, clamouring loudly for more elbow-room, in Prussian Poland, now apparently becoming Polish Prussia ; in Bohemia, where the recrudescence of the Czech language and culture has been one of the most remarkable facts of our time ; in Galicia, in Croatia, and various Hungarian Banats, and, most conspicuously and sensationally, in the Danubian Principalities so long ruled by the Ottoman Turks. North of the Danube, the Slavs have compelled Francis Joseph to reverse his original policy of ' uniting all ' the countries and tribes of the monarchy into one integral ' State,' and to bribe them, as in Croatia, by instalments of Home Rule. South of the Danube, they have surprised politicians and checked their designs, by gradually creating an entirely new political situation.

Not merely at the time of Waterloo, but even at the time of the Crimean War, and still later, it was assumed that the fate of the Balkan territories could be settled over the heads of the inhabitants. The Turk was the Sick Man, and his lands were an inheritance for his survivors, the strong men, to divide. They would devour the peninsula, like an artichoke, leaf by leaf—Austria beginning at one end of the artichoke and Russia at the other, while the other Powers snatched such stray leaves as they could for themselves, here and there. There was a certain danger—a very grave danger, indeed—that they might quarrel over the spoils, and so bring about Armageddon ; but no other hindrance to their progress was anticipated. It was not the Balkan populations who would prevent Russia from going to Constantinople or Austria from going to Salonica ; their part in the great drama to come would be that of subordinates, not of principals.

So statesmen were arguing, not only at the time of the Crimean War, when the metaphor of the Sick Man was first employed, but even at the time of the Russo-Turkish War, when the next step was taken for the partition of his estates,

and Austria occupied Bosnia as the reward of her neutrality. The same talk continued—the same idea was being followed up—when Bosnia was formally annexed. The talk, indeed, has not yet ceased—the ambitions which it expresses are not yet abandoned; and all the Powers involved in the scramble may still be heard demanding spheres of influence and commercial rights, and discussing the compensations which must be accorded to them if they are to acquiesce in each other's aggrandisement. But the conditions of the scramble are no longer what they were; and the statesmen who, in 1878, imagined that they were taking long views, reckoned without the tenacity of the minor nationalities in general, and of the minor Slav nationalities in particular.

There is no need to review the transformation in detail; it is recent history which we have all read in the papers from day to day. The first disconcerting discovery was that Bulgaria, inspired by Stambouloff, did not propose to be merely a Russian outpost on the Constantinople road; that though Russia was admittedly Bulgaria's big brother, the little brother preferred to stand alone. Servia, again, showed a resentment at the Austrian seizure of Bosnia which made it clear that, though Austrian help against Bulgarian invaders was welcome, she had no intention of being the submissive instrument of Austrian policy, or of permitting anything in the way of peaceful penetration. Then, finally, came the troubling revelation that the Balkan peoples, in spite of their long-standing feuds, were capable of concerted action. The Balkan war was made, in spite of the warnings of the Powers; and the *status quo* was disturbed, in spite of the solemn declaration of the Powers—not all of which were in earnest—that they intended it to be respected.

These are great changes with a dynamic, as well as a static, value. They give us, that is to say, not merely a new map, but also a new parallelogram of forces, which is bound to produce a new resultant; and the problem of the political prophet is to find that resultant by weighing those forces, remembering:

1. That the Balkan League, in spite of the dissensions which have, for the time being, dissolved it, remains a potential force to which certain menaces might, at any time, restore its actuality and indeed seem likely to restore it fairly soon.

2. That the Balkan peoples who are free, and rejoicing in their freedom, have kinsmen who remain in reluctant servitude to the older Powers, and cherish a lively recollection of a time when they and their nationals constituted a great imperial race.

To a certain extent the problem created by these forces affects all the Powers ; but it is Austria's problem in a peculiar degree. In the case of other Powers it only affects foreign interests, whereas in the case of Austria it affects domestic interests. The great difference between Austria and Russia in the connexion is this : that Russia is really a Slav Power, whereas Austria is only a Power with a large number of Slav subjects—to say nothing of Roumanian subjects to whom Austrian (or Hungarian) rule is equally objectionable. And this difference carries consequences. There is no Bulgaria Irredenta on Russian soil : Bulgarian obstinacy may obstruct the expansion of Russia, but there could be no movement of Bulgarian origin designed to precipitate the ' break-up ' of Russia. In Austria, on the contrary, the unexpected obstruction offered to Austrian expansion is neither the only trouble nor the greatest danger : for her the great problem lies in the future relations between her unredeemed Slavs and their would-be redeemers. For the Slavs of Austria, as must always be remembered, outnumber both the Teutons and the Magyars.

Not all of them count ; for some of them are fairly contented, and others are so situated that they can do little harm. The Poles of Galicia are very well as they are, being better treated than any Poles elsewhere, and having no desire to fall into the hands of the Russians, whose little fingers are notoriously thicker than the Austrians' loins. The Czechs, owing to their geographical situation—a Slav *enclave* in the midst of Germans—can hardly be dangerous, in spite of their uproarious and menacing demeanour. For the present, at all events, their newly-awakened racial self-consciousness can only express itself in noise, the slinging of ink-pots, and an attempt to boycott the German language. But the case of the Slavs of the South is very different. They are of Servian race, and constitute a compact and increasing body, dissatisfied with their position, placed in close proximity to the independent kingdom of Servia—which kingdom is perpetually at loggerheads with the Dual Monarchy, and cherishes

ideals of expansion at the expense of that Monarchy. There exists, that is to say, a question of Servia Irredenta, analogous, in almost every respect, to the old question of Italia Irredenta ; and it is a live issue of constantly increasing vitality.

The analogy, though not quite complete—for historical analogies are never quite complete—is nevertheless so close that the observer can distribute the parts almost as if he were casting a great historical drama. The analogues of Lombardy and Venetia are, of course, Croatia, Istria, Dalmatia, and various other Austro-Hungarian provinces. The rôle of the King of Sardinia, dreaming of the glories of imperial Rome and aspiring to be King of a United Italy, can be assigned to the King of Servia, dreaming of the glories of the Empire of Stephen Dushan, and aspiring to be King of a United Servia. There remains the important rôle of *tertius gaudens* or ' honest broker,' filled in 1859 by the Emperor of the French ; and for that part there may be competitors.

Mazzini, foreseeing the drama, assigned the part to Italy. Austria, in his view, was ' not a nation but only a system of ' government ' ; its union was only artificial, and rested upon no basis of sentiment ; national sentiment was bound, in the long run, to prove stronger than any system of government. The Balkan peoples, that is to say, were sure, in the long run, to assert themselves and free themselves ; and Italian sympathy ought to go out to them, just as French sympathy had gone out to the Italians. Italy might gain something for herself in the process, just as France had gained something for herself through the liberation of Italy. In any case, the Balkan peoples were naturally the friends, and Austria—still holding Trentino and South Tyrol—was naturally the enemy of Italy.

The course of events has only partially fulfilled that prediction. The Balkan Federation has come ; but the attitude of Italy towards it has not been quite that which Mazzini prognosticated. Italy, on the contrary, liberated from servitude, has developed imperial ambitions of her own, and is engaged, at the hour of writing, in creating a question of Graecia Irredenta in Epirus and the South Aegean, acting in diplomatic conjunction with Austria, whom, nevertheless, she does not love. If that policy continues, the Balkan peoples must look elsewhere for their influential friend ; and all the

indications point to the Tsar of Russia as the most probable analogue of Napoleon III. The desire to avenge the snub administered to him at the time of the annexation of Bosnia might furnish him with a motive if he needed one; and he might look for his reward, not merely in the increase of Slav, as opposed to Teuton, influence in Europe, but also in those Austrian Slav territories which adjoin his Empire, and contain a certain number of Little Russians of Orthodox creed.

These, at any rate, are the principal factors and forces with which political prediction has to reckon. The next thing to be done, if we want to judge what is likely to come of these forces, is to form some estimate of the numbers and sentiments of the inhabitants of that Servia Irredenta which is such a thorn in the side of the Austrian Administration. We will take the figures published shortly before the recent wars by Prince Lazarovich-Hrebelianovich in his chapter on 'Servian 'Lands under Foreign Domination':

SERB POPULATION ESTIMATED FOR DECEMBER 1909
(*on basis of yearly percentage of increase*).

A. INDEPENDENT SERVIAN LANDS.

Kingdom of Servia	2,923,000
Principality of Montenegro	280,000

B. SERVIAN LANDS UNDER FOREIGN DOMINATION.

Bosnia-Herzgovina (under Austria-Hungary)	1,713,000
Dalmatia (under Austria)	667,000
Istria (under Austria)	133,000
Croatia-Slavonia (under Hungary)	2,334,000
Banat and Batchka (under Hungary)	872,000
Old Servia (under Turkey)	1,376,000
Total for the Serb race	10,298,000

Old Servia, of course, has been emancipated since these statistics were compiled, and the proportion between free and subject Servians has consequently been modified. There remain, however, roughly speaking, about 5,700,000 Servians living under the rule of Austria and Hungary. It would be a formidable number for the Empire to control, even if they constituted the only alien element in a population in other respects homogeneous, and had no enthusiastic sympathisers across the frontier. But the Austro-Hungarian

Empire is not homogeneous—it is a fortuitous concourse of racial atoms; and the subject Servians have, as we have seen, their *point d'appui* south of the Danube. Hence the importance of considering how the Servians, whether within or without the Empire, regard the Austrians, and how the free and subject Servians regard each other.

That the Servians detest the Austrians is one of those crude and obvious facts which it is superfluous to prove. Whatever doubts may have been entertained on the subject in the past, none have been possible since the turmoil caused by the annexation of Bosnia in 1908. At that date, and subsequently, we have seen the Servians of Servia eager to make war upon Austria without the remotest prospect of victory, and the Servians of Croatia organising such demonstrations that constitutional guarantees were suspended and a state of siege was declared among them. In that respect, at all events, the two branches of the race are at one; and the only question is whether their common racial and political aspirations are not counterbalanced by their religious divisions.

How that may be no one knows for certain; and different people who are by way of knowing maintain diametrically opposite opinions with approximately equal emphasis. Those differences themselves—relating mainly to the doctrine of the double procession of the Holy Ghost—seem grave or trivial according to the point of view from which they are examined; and the question for us is, not what is the right point of view, but what is likely to be the point of view of the particular theologians concerned. The tendency of the times, throughout the world, certainly is for racial self-consciousness to increase, and for dogmatic fanaticism to diminish in intensity. As a rule, indeed, one finds that theological prejudice is a real force only when it is allied with racial antipathies or material interests as it now is in Ulster; and one infers that the time is coming, if it has not yet come, when, if the two motives clash, the former will infallibly prevail.

Its tendency to predominate is, indeed, in these Slav countries a comparatively new fact, noticeable perhaps only during the last decade; but a long series of proofs establishing the fact are marshalled in Mr. Steed's examination of the foreign policy of the Hapsburg monarchy. Perhaps the most typical indication is furnished by the contrast between the receptions

accorded, in the course of the same day, at Ragusa, to Prince Danilo of Montenegro and to the late Archduke Ferdinand: the former acclaimed with uproarious enthusiasm, and the latter met with stony silence. But, of course, there is also much evidence of a more substantial character: notably the Austrian apprehension of Pan-Servian intrigue which led to the notorious Agram trials; the Austrian talk of a 'punitive expedition' against Servia; and finally the brutal murder of the Archduke and his wife in Sarajevo. Through these incidents and tragedies one clearly perceives a passionate racial movement, whose chief *raison d'être* is to carve a Greater Servia out of the Hapsburg dominions.

If the situation were simple, and only Austria and Servia were concerned with it, Austria might anticipate the danger and dispose of it before it became formidable; but the situation is not simple, and Austria cannot take that course without touching the interests of other countries, and so, in all probability, precipitating the dreaded universal war. Austria, that is to say, can only play a waiting game; and this is one of the cases in which the waiting game is almost bound to be a losing game. Time is on the side of Servia for several reasons: because Slav strength increases faster than the power of the Austrian State, and because time will bring a prospect of the healing of the wounds caused by the recent Balkan quarrels.

Those who predict that the Balkan dissensions will be permanent because they have been bitter must have forgotten the object lessons of history. Hübner said very much the same about the Italians in 1848; but the event has proved him a false prophet. Switzerland, which is now one of the most united countries in Europe, had its last civil war as recently as 1847. Even in German Europe the question of hegemony had to be settled on the battle-field less than half a century ago; but a keen perception of common German interests has ended by bringing all the Germans together. One can see no reason why the same thing should not happen in the Balkan world, and one can see a good many reasons why it should. The Balkan peoples are sure, in the end, to see—what the spectator of the game can see already—that only by sinking, or adjusting, their differences can they acquire the right to live their own national lives, and develop on their own lines. Some Bulgarian diplomatists have admitted that they already see it.

Austria, no doubt, with Germany to help her, will do, and is already doing, her best to foment and perpetuate the dissensions, and to create new sources of influence hostile to the Balkan block. The encouragement shown to Bulgaria ; the refusal to allow Servia a port on the Adriatic, or to permit Montenegro to annex Scutari—the centre of Austrian influence in Albania ; the establishment of the German military mission in Constantinople : all these things are demonstrations of the trend of Austrian policy. Their significance, from the point of view of the German world, was recently set forth in a striking article written by the Vienna correspondent of the *Frankfurter Zeitung* :

' The countries comprising the Triple Alliance,' writes the correspondent, ' which were formerly agricultural countries, are now becoming manufacturing countries. The question of the unimpeded importation of food and raw material is one of extreme importance for them. A war against England, France, and Russia would result in the interruption of all the sea routes. The one route remaining for the Alliance is that which leads through Roumania, Bulgaria, and Turkey to Asia Minor. The Triple Alliance must be assured that that route will always be open to it. That is the explanation of the energetic and menacing attitude of German diplomacy towards the first rumours of a partition of Asia Minor. The interest which the Empire has in keeping the road to Asia Minor open was set above that of the German capital invested in the Baghdad railway ; and the German military mission to Constantinople is an advantage as precious to Germany as to Turkey. This aspect of the matter explains why Austria and Germany resolutely opposed the internationalisation of the Adrianople-Constantinople section of the Orient line. For all the countries interposed between Hungary and Asia Minor, one rule must be rigorously laid down : either they must be the friends and allies of the Triple Alliance, or they must reckon upon the implacable hostility of that Alliance.'

That is a characteristically German offer of friendship. ' Be my brother or I will smash you ' is the obvious paraphrase. It is the kind of offer which is never exactly acceptable, though it is sometimes accepted when addressed to the weak who have no friends. But the Balkan States are not so weak as all that, unless they allow themselves to be taken in detail ; and they have friends—or, at all events, backers—who might want to know the reason why, if the threatened ' implacable hostility ' were to be manifested by any deliberate act of aggression. So that the situation must, almost of necessity, be allowed to

develop without violent interruption ; and the lines on which it has latterly tended to develop have been emphatically unfavourable to Austro-Hungarian predominance.

A little while ago it was assumed that Austria had Roumania in her pocket as the pledged supporter of the Triple Alliance, that the annexation of Bosnia was an irrevocable step on the road to Salonica, and that Servia was Austria's *protégée*, to be backed against Russia's *protégée*, Bulgaria, and to become, in the fulness of time, if not an Austrian province, at least an Austrian sphere of influence. From whatever source effective opposition to the programme might come, it was not expected to come from the Christian populations of the Balkan States. But the probabilities have changed, and are still changing, under our eyes. Roumania has made it clear that hegemony in the Balkans would please her better than dependence, however privileged, upon Austria. A secret treaty has been published, binding Bulgaria, in certain contingencies, to join Servia in taking the field against Austria ; while Servia not only lives in a state of perpetually strained relations with Austria, who is always bullying her, but openly avows the ambition of rolling back the tide of Austro-Hungarian aggrandisement, just as Austria and Hungary in the past—helped by the Slav John Sobieski—rolled back the tide of Moslem conquest.

We may quote the expression of the Servian ideal set forth in the concluding paragraphs of Prince Lazarovich-Hrebelianovich's book. Racial self-consciousness, he insists, ' forced ' into latency during the Turkish domination,' is now ' a ' living power among all Servian peoples ' ; and he concludes :

' The sentiment for union and the determination to bring all Servian regions into a great State organism that shall be national in its expression, in its genius, and in its aims, embodying the will and the ideals of the race, are common to-day to all Serbs.

' It is the belief of the Servians that neither the Hapsburgs (Austria-Hungary) nor other European Powers will be able in the long run to prevent Servian unification.

' Too bold is the man who presumes to forecast the course of future events, but Destiny ever endows her children with opportunity, and the Serbs believe that, matching an alert will with opportunity, the inhabitants of the various regions of the Serb block of territory will, in course of time, as by the action of natural forces, come together into one great State, and the work of Nemanya, the work of

Dushan, the work of Lazar, the work of Kara-George and Milosh Obrenovich, of the modern Kingdom and of the Principality, and the dreams of all Serbs still under foreign rule, will culminate in the realisation of the concept dear to them these many centuries —a great and united Servia.'

That is to say that the gradual, but unceasing, recrudescence of racial self-consciousness among the southern Slavs (the majority of whom are Servians) has made them pieces instead of pawns on the European chess-board, and, in doing so, has transformed a dream into a programme. The same result is, at the same time, obviously following from a similar process at work in the minds of Roumanians and Greeks, and the study of the transformation helps us to foresee and define the antagonisms which will divide Europe in the years immediately in front of us.

There may be danger in the conflicting ambitions of the Triple Alliance and the Triple Entente ; but that is a danger which diplomacy should be able to avert. The rivalries do not rest upon racial antipathies ; the points of difference can be, and normally are, discussed in a spirit of give-and-take, and with a sincere desire to come to terms, animated by a wise reluctance to take risks. The really irreconcilable antagonism is that between the Teuton races (with whom are the Magyars) and the Slav races (with whom are likely to be found the Roumanians and the Greeks). It is irreconcilable because Teutons and Magyars conceive it to be their mission to govern, and have long been accustomed to govern, Slavs ; whereas the Slavs, on their part, are tired of being governed by Teutons and Magyars, have remained for centuries irresponsive to all attempts to assimilate them, and are daily gaining fresh faith in their separate destiny. Collision is as inevitable as when express trains move in opposite directions along the same line of rails ; and Servia seems to be the predestined point of contact, because it is there that racial self-consciousness and racial aspirations have attained the most advanced development.

Many Austrian statesmen, strongly supported, it is believed, by the murdered Archduke, have for some time past been in favour of substituting Trialism for the present Dualism of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. The idea is—or was—that

on the death of the Emperor Francis Joseph a separate Slav kingdom should be organised, equal in privileges and dignity to the Kingdom of Hungary. By thus making the Austrian Slavs loyal and contented, Austria would deprive the Servia Irredenta question of its actuality. The Hungarian question was solved in that way by the Ausgleich of 1867. Why should not a second, and similar, Ausgleich appease the discontent of the Servian subjects of what would then be the Triple Monarchy ?

It might do so if the circumstances, both material and sentimental, were precisely analogous ; but they are not. Some of the differences are pointed out by Mr. Steed ; and there are others. It will be worth while to enumerate them :

1. The Magyars were in 1867, as they are now, a compact people, living within the boundaries of the Empire. They had no compatriots with whom they could aspire to be united. Deliverance from Austria would have left them at the mercy of Russia. Equality of treatment within the Empire was the best that they could hope for ; and they agreed to the compromise, not because they loved the Austrians, but because there was no other way of preserving their national existence. The unredeemed Servians, on the contrary, have before their eyes the alternative of union with free Servia.

2. The Magyars were not so numerous that their emancipation threatened to give them a controlling influence in the affairs of the Empire. The Slavs, on the contrary, are so numerous that their emancipation would shift the centre of gravity in Austria and make them the masters of those whose subjects they have hitherto been.

3. There was no division of Magyar sympathies, because there was only one homogeneous group of Magyar peoples. There are, on the contrary, several groups of Slavs—Czechs and Poles as well as Servians ; and union with Czechs and Poles, though not perhaps in the abstract unacceptable to the Servians, is not the ideal which they cherish, and could hardly be expected to divert them from the dream of union with their brethren south of the Danube.

4. There was no race within the Empire capable, in 1867, of raising any effective objection to the emancipation of the Magyars ; but the Magyars themselves, proud of their predominance, and masterful in upholding it, have the strongest

possible objection to any proposal for treating the Slavs as their equals.

The last difficulty is one on which Mr. Steed lays most stress. This is how he sums the matter up:

'During the first years of the Dual System, when the affairs of Hungary were guided by men of superior political talent, there appeared some reason to believe that the Magyars, acting as *primi inter pares*, would group round them the southern Slav peoples, and acquire, with their support, the leadership in the monarchy. This solution now seems to be past hoping for. From the standpoint of the internal cohesion of the monarchy, the Magyar State has acted as a repellent force, powerless for good, powerful for evil; and, pending proof to the contrary, students of Hapsburg affairs are constrained to regard the Magyars rather as a liability than as an asset of the crown.'

He adds that the present generation of Magyars seem to be 'so steeped in chauvinism as to have lost all sense of their 'real position in Europe'; and one feels it difficult to believe that, even if, as Mr. Steed thinks might possibly happen, the instinct of self-preservation prompted them to change their tone at the eleventh hour, the southern Slavs would be very favourably inclined towards their overtures. Austria, in that case, they would feel, would only be offering them a compromise as a substitute for an ideal; and it is one of the characteristics of the tenacious Slav that he prefers ideals to compromises,—especially when the compromise is not proposed until after all attempts to crush the ideal have failed.

The idea of Trialism, therefore, strikes one as a counsel of despair rather than as the inspiration of a statesman of genius; and one is left with the firm conviction that this question of Servia Irredenta—coupled, in all likelihood, with the sister question of Roumania Irredenta—is the question destined to bring to a head the many points at issue between German Europe and those younger nationalities which resent the dictatorial and domineering ways of Germans. When it will come and how—who will be involved in it, and with what result: these are matters about which it would be rash to prophesy. The disruption of Austria which has so long been predicted may, or may not, arise out of it. Russia, Germany, and Italy may, or may not, find the opportunity

of gathering up those fragments in which they are severally interested. But students of politics who attach more importance to the play of forces than to the provisional expedients of diplomacy are satisfied that this is a quarrel which has to be fought out, and that Austria will no more be able to prevent in the future the formation of a United Servia than she was in the past to prevent the formation of a United Italy, and a United Germany from which she was excluded.

The rumour of King Peter's abdication, circulated in the middle of June last, suggests the possibility of internal dissensions which might operate as a set-back. It is not quite certain that Prince Alexander's succession would in that case be undisputed. His elder brother, Prince George, whose violence and eccentricities brought about his resignation, under pressure, of his rights as Crown Prince, is believed still to have the support of a powerful military party in the country; and he may be tempted to fight for the recovery of his lost inheritance. Should he do so, we may see a divided Servia, before we see a Greater Servia. But this report of King Peter's retirement was contradicted almost as soon as it was affirmed; and it is improbable that it will be allowed to take effect unless his heir is felt to be master of the situation.

FRANCIS GRIBBLE.

THE EXPANSION OF ITALY

1. **Storia degli Ultimi Trent' Anni del Secolo XIX.** Narrata da PIETRO VIGO. Milan: Fratelli Trèves. 1913.
2. **Francesco Crispi. Politica Estera. Memorie e documenti raccolti e ordinati.** Da T. PALAMENGHI-CRISPI. Milan: Fratelli Trèves. 1912.
3. **Francesco Crispi. Questioni Internazionali. Diario e documenti ordinati.** Da T. PALAMENGHI-CRISPI. Milan: Fratelli Trèves. 1913.
4. **Histoire de la Guerre Italo-Turque, 1911–1912.** Par un Témoin. Paris: Berger-Levrault. 1912.
5. **Sopra le Vie del Nuovo Impero.** Da ENRICO CORRADINI. Milan: Fratelli Trèves. 1912.
6. **Italy in North Africa.** By W. K. MCCLURE. Constable. 1913.

IN order to gain a clear idea of the growth of modern Italy, it is necessary to go back to early days and trace, however cursorily, the course of the international relations of the new kingdom.

When the Italians entered Rome the only foreign power which was friendly to the new nation was France. The Government of National Defence which had replaced the Empire offered congratulations on the downfall of the Papal Power. This cordiality was, however, short-lived. The advent of Thiers to power completely changed the complexion of Franco-Italian relations. Thiers listened favourably to the petition of the French bishops on behalf of Pius IX., recalled the French Minister at Florence who had forwarded the congratulations of the Government to Victor Emmanuel on the capture of Rome, and instructed the Comte de Choiseul, the new minister, to leave Italian territory at the moment of the King's triumphal entry into Rome in July 1871. These steps, together with the hurried resumption of diplomatic relations with the Holy See, constituted an attitude towards Italy which Italians regarded as slighting, and undoubtedly sowed the seeds of that distrust of France which still exists in the Italian mind. Relations indeed became so strained during these early years of the new kingdom that in 1873 the representatives of both

countries absented themselves for several months from their posts. It was just at this juncture that the Austrian Emperor invited Victor Emmanuel to visit the Viennese Exhibition; while a confidential *communiqué* from Bismarck informed Visconti-Venosta, the Italian Foreign Minister, that acceptance of the invitation to Vienna would be followed by one to Berlin. Some sort of reconciliation with Austria was a pressing necessity; you cannot quarrel permanently with your next-door neighbour, and any overtures from his Apostolic Majesty were welcome in view of the constant anti-Italian policy of the Vatican and the additional friction created with the great Catholic Power by the recently passed law suppressing the religious orders throughout the Peninsula. The King hesitated: the name of Austria not unnaturally stank in the nostrils of one of his race, and it required all the eloquence of Visconti-Venosta and of Minghetti, the Prime Minister, to persuade him to undertake the journey.

His ministers prevailed, and the King visited both Vienna and Berlin. His reception in both cities was cordial.* Return visits were paid by the two Emperors in 1875. In the meanwhile, Macmahon had succeeded Thiers in France, and had considerably mitigated the strain of Franco-Italian relations by recalling the French cruiser which had been stationed since 1870 at Civita Vecchia for the Pope's use in the event of his wishing to leave Rome. Nevertheless, Germany and Austria had taken time by the forelock, and it was to them rather than to France that Italian statesmen continued to look as friends and possible allies. Already the foundations of the understanding which was soon to find expression in the Triple Alliance were laid.

The next important event in Italian history, and one destined profoundly to affect its course, was the fall of the Right who had held office almost continuously from 1849. The Conservative ministers had made themselves unpopular through the heavy taxation they had been obliged to impose in order to meet the financial engagements of the nation, and

* It is a curious circumstance, and one which shows how difficult it is to gauge the value of actually contemporary events, that Minghetti was greatly influenced at the moment by his fear of a successful Royalist reaction in France with the result of a new crusade in favour of the Pope under the leadership of Henri V.

by a definite preference for men of the north—Piedmontese, Tuscans, and Lombards—for the administration of Government offices. The Radicals who now came into power had for the most part been Republicans, and Depretis, whom the King entrusted with the formation of the new Government, had been pro-dictator of Sicily before the conversion of the Republican wing of the national movement to the Monarchy. With regard to Foreign Affairs, the Left did not behave on reaching power quite as might have been expected. Bismarck had more than once been in direct communication with their leaders, and when he initiated the Kulturkampf in Prussia with the May laws, the Italian Radicals did their best to induce Minghetti to introduce analogous legislation against the Church. Depretis, however, as Prime Minister, took quite a different line and adopted an attitude of friendly deference towards the Church that was rather disconcerting to the Cabinets of Berlin and Vienna. But his efforts at conciliation were in vain; for the French clericals, infuriated by the elevation of the Italian legation at Paris and the French legation to the Quirinal into embassies, became more anti-Italian than ever. It was at this moment that Francesco Crispi re-entered the political scene.

It is hardly too much to say of this great man that, although his policy led his country to the verge of bankruptcy, and had eventually to be greatly modified, if not altogether abandoned, he was to United Italy what Cavour had been to the movement of the Risorgimento. The leaders of the Left were as a rule, however clever, mere politicians. Crispi was a statesman. He could see beyond the needs of party; he could if necessary sacrifice party views for the good of the State. And he had the same suspicion of rhetoric—that constant bane of Italian politics—the same love of cold hard facts that had stood Cavour in such good stead during the long waiting game which he played for the independence of Italy.

Francesco Crispi was born in 1819, of mixed Albanian and Sicilian descent, at Ribera in Sicily. When the famous Revolution of '48 broke out at Palermo, he hastened thither from Naples, where he was living and practising as an advocate, and took a leading part in guiding the movement. In the following year the Bourbons were restored, and Crispi had

to fly into exile in Piedmont. Once more, in 1853, he had to fly—this time on account of his implication in the Mazzinian conspiracy at Milan. Expelled from France, where he had sought a temporary refuge, he joined Mazzini in London, and there remained until 1859, when he returned to Italy. Thence he proceeded to Sicily in disguise for the purpose of preparing the insurrectionary movement of 1860.

He assisted Garibaldi in the organisation of the expedition of the Thousand, and after the fall of Palermo was appointed Minister of the Interior and of Finance in the provisional government of Sicily. On the annexation of the Two Sicilies to the kingdom of Victor Emmanuel, he resigned and entered the Parliament of 1861 as deputy of the extreme Left for Castelvetrano, speedily acquiring at Montecitorio the reputation of being the most violent member of the Republican party. It was not long, however, before party views gave way to patriotism. In 1864, he definitely separated himself from Mazzini and openly professed the Monarchical faith.

In 1877, Crispi, who had already been elected President of the Chamber of Deputies, was invited to proceed on a secret mission to the principal European Courts. Depretis, in the letter in which he thanks Crispi for having accepted the King's proposal, refers to the purpose of this mission as '*di far prevalere nelle rispettive legislazioni i principii liberali sanciti nel Codice Civile Italiano*,' which sounds, as it was perhaps intended to sound, somewhat vague. Depretis, however, goes on to say that the envoy is to profit by his 'journey abroad' in order to interview Prince Bismarck and press on him the desirability of a definite treaty of alliance between Germany and Italy which, founding itself on common interests, will provide for all eventualities. He further points out that there is danger to Italy not only from the Ultramontane party, but also from the possibility of the aggrandisement of Austria through the annexation of Turkish provinces, and that it is necessary that Italy and Germany should be in thorough accord as to how that hypothetical situation should be met.

Crispi's diary gives a graphic account of his first interview with Bismarck. That potentate was very affable and willing to make a treaty of 'commercial equality' and of alliance

with Italy in the case of a Franco-Italian war, although he did not consider such an eventuality within reasonable prospect of occurring, as it seemed to him impossible without the restoration of the Monarchy. As to Austria, he resisted all Crispi's blandishments. The only difference of opinion that could arise between the Cabinets of Vienna and Berlin would be the result, he thought, of a possible Polish rising. (Here the Princess arrived with a glass of lemonade and speedily disappeared.) Refreshed, Bismarck proceeded to the effect that nothing would induce him to go behind the back of Andrassy whose intentions were, he was convinced, of the most friendly description ; nor would he even discuss the possible annexation by Austria of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Crispi had to retire with the promise of a treaty of commercial and civil reciprocity and a German alliance in case Italy should be attacked by France.

Depretis was rather upset by Bismarck's refusal to discuss the consequences to Italy of an eventual aggrandisement of Austria ; but Crispi assured him that the question was not closed, but that, to be reopened fruitfully, it would have to be discussed at Vienna and at London. Had it already occurred to him that the projected Dual Alliance would have to be enlarged ? At a final interview with Bismarck at Berlin, he obtained the reciprocity treaty for German and Italian subjects, and a defensive alliance with Germany in the event of an invasion of Italian territory by France. In the course of this conversation, Bismarck remarked airily that he had been talking to Andrassy about Crispi and Italy, and had dwelt on the friendly feelings of the Italian Cabinet towards Austria, and that Andrassy had expressed his gratification at the news. *' Vidi Andrassy e gli dissi che eravate stato da me, e che ' il governo Italiano vuol vivere in una buona amicizia coll' ' Austria. Ne fu lieto e mi incaricò di salutarvi.'* Bismarck further recommended Crispi to make friends with Andrassy. The Comic Muse who inspired this scene must have enjoyed it.

From Berlin, Crispi went to London where, failing to see Disraeli who was ill, he was received by Derby, who disillusioned him as to the views of the English Cabinet on the question of compensation to Italy in the event of the extension of Austrian power on the Adriatic. It was a disappointment, as Disraeli had appeared to admit in conversation with Menabrea, the Italian Ambassador, that the Italian claims in such

circumstances would be just. On October 10, after a few days in Paris, he proceeded to Vienna, intent on putting the Italian point of view before the Austrian Minister. But Robilant, the Italian Ambassador, checked him by explaining that under no circumstances must he make the faintest allusion to any question of compensation for the increase of Austrian influence. The occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina was regarded by the Austrian Government rather as an act of abnegation and self-sacrifice in the interests of the whole of Europe than as an act of self-aggrandisement. His interview with Andrassy limited itself to the exchange of those '*complimenti*' which Italians know so well how to administer.

Thus Crispi's first 'circular' trip did not seem to bring off much for Italian diplomacy. It is, however, significant for the student of Italian Foreign Affairs, as it shows very clearly their point of departure since 1870—namely, fear of France and Austria. And this double anxiety has never ceased to influence all Italian Foreign Ministers.

In 1879 Germany and Austria formed a defensive alliance against the possible attack by Russia on either nation; but it was not until 1882 that Italy joined the league, thereby constituting the Triple Alliance. The immediate cause was the anti-French feeling caused in Italy by the French expedition to Tunis and the subsequent occupation of the country by France. The French resented the pretensions of Italy in the matter of the Tunisian railways and, apart from any such definite point of difference, there remained then, as perhaps there always will remain in France, a strong Catholic prejudice against the new nation which had reached its independence and sovereignty by upsetting the Papal throne. Italian statesmen for their part had already begun to realise the importance of the Mediterranean since the cutting of the Isthmus of Suez and the consequent necessity of preserving and increasing Italian prestige in North Africa.

The ostensible pretext of the French expedition to Tunis was the punishment of the Krumiri—a neighbouring tribe only nominally subject to the Bey of Tunis, who had crossed the Algerian frontier and assailed an Algerian tribe. French troops had gone to the assistance of the attacked natives and a fight of eleven hours' duration took place, which resulted in some French losses. The French Government, proceeding

on the assumption of the indifference of the Bey, prepared an expedition. Great resentment was caused in Italy by these events, and when the expedition resulted in the permanent occupation of Tunis by the French the Italians became more than ever persuaded that France was their enemy. It was evident, also, that the isolation of Italy was a cause of weakness. Never would the French have dared to extend their influence, not to speak of their direct power, so openly had they not felt certain that Italy stood alone in the councils of Europe.

These feelings naturally led Italian statesmen into the arms of Germany and Austria. With Germany they had always been friends, and there were particular reasons at the moment for desiring Austrian friendship. Catholic feeling had been roused throughout Europe against Italy by the disgraceful scenes which had characterised the transference of the body of Pio Nono from the Vatican Basilica to San Lorenzo on the night of July 13. The extreme Radicals attempted in vain to place the responsibility for the scandalous rioting on that occasion at the door of the ecclesiastical authorities. As a matter of fact, the Cardinal-Vicar had forbidden Catholic societies to accompany the coffin; by his orders the 'procession' reduced itself to four carriages; and the Vatican authorities issued the strictest orders (which were as strictly obeyed) against any behaviour which could even wear the appearance of provocation. The body of Pio Nono was, however, accompanied across Rome by a motley crowd of riff-raff singing obscene songs and insulting the ecclesiastics on duty. Cardinal Jacobini's hat was snatched from his hands, the windows of Cardinal Samminiatelli's carriage were broken by stones, and Mgr. Boccali was threatened with a dagger. The police could not, or at all events did not, protect their Eminences from these gross outrages, and had it not been for the extraordinary self-control which they and the little band of Catholics who followed the procession on foot were able to maintain, bloodshed would undoubtedly have occurred. Public indignation, not only among Catholic populations, made itself heard throughout Europe, and the question of the Pope's abandonment of Rome was seriously discussed. Under these circumstances an alliance with Austria presented itself as very welcome.

The Triple Alliance between Germany, Austria, and Italy was signed in May 1882. The Cabinet of Rome did not thereby secure all that Italian statesmen felt to be desirable, but the nation was at all events protected against possible French aggression and the eternal Vatican danger could be disregarded.

The signing of the Triple Alliance brought to a conclusion the first stage in the development of the new kingdom. It left Italy permanently alienated from France—the only foreign power which had intervened in the cause of the national freedom, and which from a racial and territorial point of view seemed a natural ally. It bound Italy to her hereditary enemy, Austria, and obliged her ministers to disavow the aspirations of the Italians in the Trentino, who still remained in the clutch of the two-headed Eagle. The alliance with Germany was no doubt the best part of the transaction. Italy could take her place in the Councils of Europe no longer isolated, but with the support of the great Chancellor. That statesman indeed had succeeded in bringing about all he desired. During the twelve years that had followed the capitulation of Paris, he had concentrated all his efforts on one point—to render France impotent for revenge Certainly he had succeeded beyond expectation.

In considering the motives and causes of the growth of modern Italy it is impossible to overlook the very important phenomenon of emigration. The nature, the sociological importance and results of this factor in the national destinies, have been greatly misunderstood outside the Peninsula, while Italians themselves have only of late years begun to appreciate the facts at their true value.

The number of Italian emigrants has increased enormously during the last forty years. In 1878 there were 96,000 ; in 1900 the number had increased to 352,782. The maximum was reached in 1906 with a total of 787,977, after which date there has been a certain decline. In 1907 there were 704,675, and in 1909, 625,637, since when the figures oscillate between 600,000 and 500,000. About half of these emigrants are temporary and return, when they have saved some money, to their country. It is generally supposed that Italian emigration is the result of the miserable poverty of the lower classes in Italy. This

explanation, though not without a certain truth, is much too summary. It is not only the poorer districts that furnish emigrants : rich provinces like Tuscany, Liguria, and Lombardy provide a formidable contingent. Moreover, the statistics of emigration attained their maximum during the first decade of this century—the period during which national prosperity reached its highest point since the emancipation. Among the other factors which have to be considered, the psychological element is of great importance. Italians, a race of mountaineers and seamen, have adventurous souls, and enjoy the fun of seeking their fortunes in distant lands. It is perfectly true, of course, that wages are very low in Italy—particularly the wages of agricultural labourers. In the south, throughout whole districts which are sterile and rocky, we find great density of population—as many as 120 inhabitants to the square kilometre. The birthrate, 32 per 1000, is the highest in Europe after Russia and Hungary. Such conditions form a strong inducement to energetic people to seek a better living elsewhere.

The results of emigration have been very favourable for the country. The emigrant who fails hardly ever returns ; he has too much pride and self-love to '*fare una brutta figura*' among his old friends. All those who do return, return more or less well off—their pockets full of savings. In the Valtellina in the north of Piedmont, where there is no emigration, the villages are falling to pieces with age and decay ; in the provinces of Novara and Turin, on the other hand, where the statistics of emigration are high, the peasants live in ' tastefully decorated ' villas with gardens. Money is not the sole asset with which the repatriated emigrant returns. He has acquired abroad a taste for order, for cleanliness, and comfort, and there can be little doubt that the social, moral, and intellectual progress, so noticeable in the north of Italy, is due in the main to emigration. Compare the Spanish peasant—superstitious, unlettered, hating the foreigner because he does not understand him—with the open-minded, courteous, hospitable Piedmontese or Lombard. The great difference is that the Italian has that knowledge of the world that nothing but travelling can give. He knows by experience that it is possible to live, eat, and dress very differently in different parts of the globe. From a eugenist point of view emigration has been very good for the race.

In mountainous districts a population that never leaves home ends in physiological degradation of type through repeated intermarriage with near relatives. The number of *crétins* and goitrous persons has rapidly decreased in the valleys of Aosta and Susa since emigration became general there.

It is incontestable that emigration has increased the world-importance of Italy both by creating centres of Italian activity outside the mother-country and by improving the moral and social conditions of so many emigrants who return to their home a valuable element in the population.

All these results are undoubtedly highly advantageous, but there is something to be said on the other side. More than once emigration has provoked difficulties between Italy and foreign countries.

There are in Tunisia about 140,000 Italians, mostly agricultural labourers or small farmers with a sprinkling of tradesmen ; while the French population, consisting for the most part of functionaries, does not exceed 40,000 in number. Such a situation is obviously abnormal, and Crispi's saying that 'Tunisia is an Italian colony guarded by French soldiers' seems a fair statement of fact. The annexation of Tripolitania, however, may be expected to relieve the tension by draining the greater part of the Sicilian and Calabrian emigrants from Tunisia to the new Italian colony of Libya. In the Turkish Empire, Italians are very numerous, and difficulties constantly arise. The treatment of Italian immigrants by the local authorities in Tripolitania was one of the causes of the war that has enriched Italy with a new colony. The ardent Irredentism of Italian workmen in Austria makes them suspect to the Government, and they are distinctly unpopular in Switzerland, largely because they send their savings home instead of spending them in the country of their adoption. They are, as an almost invariable rule, sober and economical besides being very hardworking, and thus find it possible to undersell the native labour in most countries. This has been a difficulty for some time in the United States and in Brazil, and had much to do with the prohibition two years ago of Italian immigration by the Government of the Argentine, which was ostensibly based on the non-observance of sanitary and hygienic precautions by the Italians.

The internal regeneration of Italy during the last forty years is one of the most remarkable phenomena of modern or indeed of any history. Mazzini, when he heard of the meeting of the first Parliament of United Italy, is said to have remarked 'We have now made Italy, but it remains to make 'the Italians.'

In truth, Italy would never have been made, had not the Italians been there to make it. The soul of the nation was already in existence when it expressed itself in the *Risorgimento*. There was much more in that movement than the merely destructive element that exists in all revolutions; although neither of those upright if narrow-minded men, Pius IX. and the King of Naples, could see it. In fact the mob element which has disgraced so many struggles for liberty was singularly lacking, if not totally absent. Italians were instinctively gentlemen in rebellion as in other moments of life. Nevertheless, after the formation of the new kingdom, there was great need of 'regeneration.' During the night of the nation's enslavement all the forms and instruments of political life, from the highest to the lowest, had become incredibly corrupt, particularly in the Papal States and in the kingdom of the Two Sicilies where religious hypocrisy was a nauseous *sine quâ non* for any sort of public career.

You cannot be 'good' if you are very poor, or, at least, abject penury takes the bloom off any virtue but the highest; hence a readjustment of finance—in fact, a general economic and social renaissance—was the first desideratum of the nation. It is impossible within the limits at our disposal to give more than a summary account of Italian development in this respect; but enough will be said to convince the reader that the birth of the Third Italy is synonymous with the upwelling into contemporary civilisation of dormant moral and social forces of very great weight. And, first, the demographic situation merits attention.

The prominent feature of this is the considerable diminution of mortality, which has more than compensated for the slight decline in the birth-rate, itself an invariable symptom of increasing prosperity. In half a century the death-rate has gone down in round figures from thirty per thousand to twenty. M. Gabriel Monod gave in the *Revue Bleue* for May 20, 1911, the following significant statistics:

'La petite vérole qui tuait, en 1887, 534 personnes sur 1 million, n'en tue plus que 13, la scarlatine 78 au lieu de 337, la typhoide 225 au lieu de 886, la malaria 126 au lieu de 595, la diphtérie 167 au lieu de 825. Aussi l'Italie s'accroît-elle annuellement de 400,000 habitants au lieu de 180,000, bien que le nombre des naissances ait légèrement diminué, tandis que le nombre des mariages a augmenté, augmentation qui est un signe caractéristique de progrès moral et de bien-être.'

And the fact that, as we have seen, emigration has increased every year renders these figures all the more remarkable. These gratifying results are due to the ceaseless war which the Government, of whatever party, wages with insanitary conditions of life, and in rural districts with the incredible ignorance of the most elementary laws of hygiene. As regards malaria, so long the curse of that beautiful land, the Government manufacture sulphate of quinine and sell it at a nominal price (10 grains for 25 centimes) in all police stations, railway stations, schools, and tobacco shops. (Tobacconists are Government employés.) In infested regions the drug is distributed gratis.

The Agrarian situation remains one of the most serious problems of the moment. In the north and in Tuscany and eastern Sicily, agriculture may be said to flourish. But elsewhere, and especially in the Roman Campagna, Calabria, and the rest of Sicily, the system of the *Latifundia* has resulted in leaving a great part of the land uncultivated, and in creating a miserable proletariat of labourers without attachment to the soil. In the Abruzzi and the Puglie—and particularly in the basin of the Po—the land is well tilled, but, being in the hands of large proprietors who pay very low wages, can furnish but a precarious support for labourers. These districts naturally furnish the heaviest contingent of emigrants. The Government has endeavoured to deal with this situation. An inter-regional agricultural institute has been created, where processes of cultivation are scientifically studied. In addition, the Government has an agricultural bank, the *Credito Agricolo*, which does a great deal of business in North Italy, mainly with the small proprietors. Labour has also organised itself into powerful syndicates counting more than 300,000 adherents, and has been able in some instances to insist on the raising of wages. The movement of the workers is, however, almost exclusively limited to Emilia, Lombardy, and Venetia.

The two principal agricultural products are wine and oil. The output of wine, which is about 55,000,000 hectolitres, has in the last forty years doubled its yearly average. This is the highest figure reached by any wine-producing country; for France only reaches her higher average of 60,000,000 with the assistance of Algeria. Nevertheless much remains to be done. As for oil, Italy produces roughly the same as Spain, 3,000,000 hectolitres, but exports 56,000,000 lire worth as against 10,000,000 exported by Spain. Here the quality of the olive may be a factor. Fruit is exported to a value of 30,000,000 lire. The production of cereals is low—a matter of seven or eight million tons, which is considerably inferior to the figures of the principal European states. In fifty years the value of the whole agricultural production of the country has advanced from 2,859,000,000 lire to 7,000,000,000, which brings the rise in value of the hectare from 124 lire to 259. The industrial development of the country has been no less remarkable. The value of the mineral production has risen from 28,000,000 lire to 78,000,000. The chemical industry, which did not exist in 1860, stands to-day for a value of 134,000,000 lire. In spite of various crises in the silk trade and the competition of the East, the value of the silk exported has increased from 200,000,000 lire to 700,000,000. Nor has this industrial development been due, as is sometimes said, to foreign capital; the statistics published recently by Sig. Ettore Lollini in the financial review, *La Società per Azionari*, prove that this is not the case. Foreign capitalists play an important but by no means a preponderant part in Italian industry.

More remarkable still is the history of Italian finance since the Risorgimento. This may be divided into four periods. In the beginning, the budgets showed deficits varying from 200,000,000 lire to 700,000,000. From 1873 to 1884 equilibrium was established—thanks to heavy taxation. Then Crispi's policy, with its heavy naval and military expenditure, resulted in a considerable yearly deficit for the next twelve years. After 1897, the finance of the country was reorganised with great ability, and soon receipts began to exceed expenditure. During the financial year of 1912–13, the budget gave receipts amounting to 2,193,000,000 lire with a credit balance of 98,000,000,

45,000,000 of which were spent on naval construction and 42,000,000 on the Tripoli Expedition. This budget had already allowed for allotments of 218,000,000 for the war and 145,000,000 for naval construction! It is also very significant that not only is 85 per cent. of the national debt placed in Italy, but also that the loan necessitated by the development of Tripolitania has been entirely covered in the country. Italy is financially independent, and financial independence is the first thing necessary for a growing nation.

One of the most characteristic facts about the political and social orientation of contemporary Italy is its essentially democratic nature. The tendency to rely on the people, to be sensitive to all the currents of public opinion, was always a characteristic of the House of Savoy in contrast to the absolute sovereigns of central and southern Italy. The Monarchy has not changed its tactics since 1870. Statesmen of the extreme Left have always been well received at the Quirinal, and democratic progress has been sure and steady.

The introduction by Giolitti's government in 1912 of a Bill making the parliamentary suffrage quasi-universal has at once crowned and developed this movement. The new law, which was voted with great enthusiasm in May 1912, raises the number of electors from 3,500,000 to 9,000,000: all male citizens now enjoy the suffrage, except persons under thirty who can neither read nor write and have not served their term of military service.

Before leaving this very imperfect and very summary account of internal (social) regeneration, it is necessary to cast a glance at the question of education.

The percentage of illiterates diminished between 1861 and 1911 from eighty-four to fifty for women and from seventy-two to forty for men. The number of illiterates is much higher in the south, particularly in Calabria and Sicily. Ignorance of everything save the catechism was one of the firm supports of Bourbon rule.* The northern rulers were more enlightened. Both in Piedmont and in the districts under Austrian rule education was encouraged. In the same way, in the Papal States, and particularly in Rome, the Pope's government laid

* See article on The Camorra in Modern Italy, Edinburgh Review, October 1911.

great stress on education; nor did the theological atmosphere in which it was imparted greatly interfere with its positive value. Children easily forget theology and remember facts. In 1911 the percentage of illiterates in Calabria and Sicily was seventy-five, while in Piedmont it was twenty-five; and in some regions of Upper Italy, which had been under Austrian rule, it fell as low as three.

The first serious effort to cope with illiteracy was the Orlando Law passed in 1904. Up till then the obligatory minimum of education was three years (from six to nine), and even this absurd standard was habitually evaded with the tacit consent of the communal authorities. Under the Act of 1904, superior classes were created and made obligatory in communes whose population exceeded a certain figure; three thousand additional evening and Sunday schools were established in regions where the percentage of illiterates was highest, and a certain standard of education became necessary for any administrative employment. This law was supplemented two years later by additional clauses for the south, the important feature of which was the substitution of the State for those communes which were too poor to support the new charges. In the six years from 1903 to 1909 the vote for public instruction rose from 52,000,000 lire to 85,000,000, of which 36,000,000 were devoted to primary education. It is evident that the Italians have determined to wipe out the reproach of illiteracy.

The Italian tricolor now flies over Tripolitania and the desert of Libya, and although the complete occupation of the new colony is not yet an accomplished fact, except on paper, it can only be a question of time and perseverance.

The rest of Europe was surprised at the suddenness of the Italian advance on Africa. It was no doubt realised that the Tripolitania was necessary to Italy and would one day be hers, but no one thought that day would be so soon. One reason for this attitude was the general belief in the poverty of Italy. A legend of that kind is hard to kill, and critics of Italian finance must have been surprised by the statement of ministers in October 1911, that the cost of the Libyan Expedition, which had reached by that time the sum of 190,000,000 lire, would be met by the reserve fund formed out

of the surplus on the budgets of the last twelve years—a fund which amounted to the comfortable total of 400,000,000 lire.

Another point on which the public opinion of Europe went wrong was the motive of Italy. The charge of megalomania, of unscrupulous Imperialism, was freely made. Never was a charge less justified. Italy had an absolute need of an outlet not only for her rapidly increasing commerce but also for her no less rapidly increasing population. It is no doubt true that the whole of Italian territory is not yet exploited to anything like its full value, but the habit of emigration must be counted with. All that can be done is, if possible, to divert the stream of emigrants that flows yearly into Tunisia and America into some Italian land beyond the seas.

Here is, and will be for many years, the principal use of the Tripolitania. That the new colony is capable of fructification has been denied both by Italian socialists and by the anti-Italian foreign press, but seems nevertheless to be true. The Senator De Martino wrote in his 'Da Derna a Tripoli e Cirene 'e Cartagine': 'The land is the same as in Tunisia; what with 'rain and the deposits in the soil, there is as much water as in 'Tunisia; but, as in Tunisia, these riches cannot be developed 'alone or by some unknown process of spontaneous generation. 'There must be a Government on the spot knowing what to 'do and how to help.' Even in the hands of the Bedouins, Cyrenaica exported 10,000,000 lire worth of barley yearly. This is not the place to relate in detail what is still vivid in the memory of all of us. It was not until facts had abundantly proved the impossibility of any peaceful penetration on the part of Italy that war was decided on. The Italians had shown great patience and perseverance in their attempts. The ports of Tripoli, Bengasi, and Derna were connected with Sicily by means of a bi-monthly service of steamers. Bengasi possessed an Italian post-office with a savings bank and free schools for boys and girls; similar institutions had been created at Tripoli. The *Banca di Roma*, which had a branch in both towns, had done a great deal towards the economic development of the country.

The Turkish Government sought by every method, both legal and illegal, to prevent this peaceful penetration. Turkish subjects who sold land to Italians were threatened and imprisoned. Native workmen were forcibly prevented by

Turkish troops from giving their labour to Italian settlers.* And what of the results of the war? Italy is certainly stronger than ever. The reawakening of the sentiments of patriotism and nationality, without which modern Italy would not have come into being, has breathed over the country, sweeping away for the time at least the egotistic preoccupations and miserable quarrels of party politics.

In *La Revue* for March 1912 was published a remarkable article by Scipione Sighele describing the contemporary *état d'âme*:

'Above all, from the moral point of view, Italy since the war is a totally different Italy. Something has been revealed in her which did not exist before. The Italian people are vibrating with an enthusiasm which at first was thought ridiculous. A breath of common passion animates all spirits. Regionalist egotism and class-tendencies, the vulgar aspirations of parties which had seized upon consciences narrowed by the utilitarianism of those who directed them, have given place by enchantment . . . to a sentiment soft as a caress, terrible as a menace which is the instinct of the race, the love of country, the desire for her greatness, the pleasure of self-sacrifice for her, placing in all hearts and mouths one only cry: Italy! Italy! Italy!'

These eloquent words are not mere ultramontane rhetoric. They represent the real state of mind not only of statesmen, not only of soldiers, but of the great mass of the people all up and down the country: the great middle class, so powerful in Italy as in all democratic states, the humble peasantry who like every other class in the country have gladly given their sons to their country's service.

We have seen that the expansion of Italy is the result of a number of phenomena—the increase of the population, emigration, economic development, the reawakening of patriotism—all of which are due to one cause, the social and moral renaissance of the race. The Italo-Turkish War, with the consequent annexation of Tripolitania, is the dominating event of this whole process; it at once resumes and crowns it and is the point of departure for the future.

What will that future be? What part is Italy destined to play in the fortunes of Europe? There is ground for thinking that it will be a very important one.

---

* See 'Le Courrier Européen' (April 25, 1908), by no means an Italophile journal.

For the last thirty years and more, the international relations of Italy have been dominated, not to say dictated, by the needs of the Triple Alliance. That Alliance at the time of its first signing was clearly necessary for the new nation. Italy with her many interests could not live in isolation. The position that had been won so largely by diplomacy—the diplomacy of one of the greatest diplomats who ever lived—had to be consolidated by a sound foreign policy. The particular policy that was adopted was open to much criticism, but it was the only one possible at the moment. The other great Latin nation was profoundly suspicious of Italy. And the extent to which the policy of the three allies was—and had to be—dictated by the anti-French policy of Bismarck turned those suspicions into what has looked like a permanent alienation. There was a moment before the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne when Italy's policy in the Near East brought the Triple Alliance almost to snapping-point. Austria always found Italy in her way in her differences with the southern Slavs—especially with Servia — in her advance towards Salonica. But after the signing of the Treaty of Lausanne, and still more after the victory of the Balkan States, the ship was put about and the Triple Alliance became closer than ever, and was indeed renewed before the time for renewal had come. Italy's position in the Alliance is, however, much better than it was. She has shown her allies that she could be independent of them in the matter of the Turkish War, and that she has no longer any intention of being the vassal of Berlin and Vienna. Apart from this difference in her relative position the situation remains *in statu quo*. There is, however, a great sympathy for the French in the heart of the Italian people, whereas their allies are cordially hated, and it is by no means impossible that—in spite of the political necessities of the past and perhaps of the present—an understanding may one day be reached between Italy and France.

The rational argument for an alliance between France and Italy seems overwhelming. Italy and France are the two great Latin powers of Europe. They have the same culture ; where their populations have remained religious, the same religion ; where they have been emancipated, they take the same definitely rational view of experience and life. Their commercial relations are intimate ; the Mediterranean is the sphere

of many of their common interests, and they have a common interest in Mohammedan civilisation. A more ancient political tradition than the *Triplice* binds Italians to France, for it was the French Revolution which, by delivering the country from the Hapsburgs and the Bourbons, gave an impulse to the unitary movement that triumphed eventually over every obstacle. Then came Napoleon with his short-lived Italian kingdom, and finally the assistance of the French in the actual conquest of their liberty.

Italy and France have, then, the same traditional culture; to a great extent the same interests in the same quarter of the globe; they are sisters in race, religion, and general mentality; they are also the only two great Continental democratic nations who stand firmly and consistently for the principles of the Revolution. Does it not seem only reasonable to suppose that an alliance so natural, so fitting, so rational, may one day be accomplished? It is impossible to avoid in this connexion the reflexion that the third great democratic power of the Old World is England, also possessing serious interests in the Mediterranean and Africa, and that England is at the present moment the ally of France; but to follow up that line of thought would take us too far afield.

ALGAR THOROLD.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE ROMAN CAMPAGNA

1. **La Campagna Romana antica, medioevale e moderna.** By GIUSEPPE TOMASSETTI. Rome: Seeber. 1910–12.
2. **Le Vicende dell'Agricoltura e della Pastorizia nell' Agro Romano. L'Annona di Roma.** By CESARE DE CUPIS. Rome: Tipografia Nazionale di C. Bertero e C. 1911.
3. **Latina Tellus.** By ARNALDO CERVESATO. Rome: Casa Editrice 'Mundus.' 1912. (English translation entitled 'The Roman Campagna.' T. Fisher Unwin. 1913.)
4. **Testo Unico delle leggi sul Bonificamento dell' Agro Romano.** Rome: Tipografia Nazionale di C. Bertero e C. 1908.
5. **Le Leggi Agrarie sull' Agro Romano—Età dei Papi.** By L. A. FRACCHIA. Rome: Pistolesi. 1907.
6. **La Question agraire en Italie—Le *Latifundium* romain.** By PAUL ROUX. Paris: Félix Alcan. 1910.
7. **Usi e costumi della Campagna Romana.** By ERCOLE METALLI. Rome: Tipografia popolare. 1903.

NONE of the great capitals of the world lies within such easy reach of wild and beautiful surroundings as Rome, and, rapidly as the city is growing, no other capital has so small a suburban area. Save in a few places where colonies of market gardeners have arisen, we pass almost at once from the city street to the open country. After crossing a belt of cultivated land and orchards, still comparatively narrow, we reach a vast rolling plain, mostly given up to pasture, spreading out for many miles in all directions, and extending as far as the vine-clad Alban Hills, the olive gardens of the Sabina, the well-farmed Etruscan country, and the almost virgin forests and marshes by the sea.

The Campagna offers some of the most striking and beautiful landscapes in Italy, while over all its vast expanse we find numberless memories of the past—ruined aqueducts, ancient tombs, medieval castles and churches, and the remains of princely villas. Yet to regard the Campagna merely as a vast graveyard of relics of the past, as a field for archaeological exploration, or as an inexhaustible well-spring of inspiration for artists and poets is to miss the full significance of this

land. The ruins and the landscape are not the whole truth; there is a new life, full of interest and vitality, emerging from the misty past, and a people whose outlook had not changed for centuries is now awakening to a new world. Yet everywhere present conditions are affected by ancient survivals, and the social and economic problems of to-day are directly linked with the customs and institutions of the Middle Ages or even of classic times.

The Campagna has always been a subject of study not only for antiquaries and historians, but also for artists and economists, and has given rise to an abundant literature. The special Campagna library in the Italian Ministry of Agriculture contains over 2000 books and pamphlets, and it is not a complete collection, while every year new works on the subject continue to appear. Quite recently this literature has been enriched by a number of important publications, which enable us to trace the history of the Agro Romano and to follow its vicissitudes—at one time a cultivated and thickly populated district, at another almost completely abandoned, and finally in process of a revival which is beginning to bring back some of its ancient prosperity.

In the dawn of history the Campagna appears to have been densely inhabited and dotted with flourishing cities, of which some, like Veii, were powerful and dangerous rivals to Rome. But as Rome expanded the neighbouring peoples were subjugated and their fields were seized and either distributed among Roman citizens or retained as *ager publicus*, to be given as a reward for services rendered to the State, or to be used as public pastures, for even then a large part of the territory was given over to grazing. During the later years of the Republic small ownership was prevalent, and much of the land was intensively cultivated by sturdy freemen, an admirable yeomanry who supplied the State with its best troops. Malaria was by no means unknown even in those early days, owing to the nature of the soil, which readily absorbs the waters of the surface like a huge sponge and retains the humidity. But the Romans combated this evil by an elaborate drainage system, and many of the Roman canals exist to this day; in some of them water still flows.

Under the earlier emperors, cultivation by freemen diminished,

their condition having then become less prosperous than it had been, and slaves gradually took their place; but for some time servile labour remained only as a subsidiary resource. As Rome grew more prosperous, the Campagna became the favourite resort of wealthy citizens, and splendid villas arose all over the plain. This reduced the number of live stock, so that after the Dacian war it was found necessary to import from Pannonia the great long-horned cattle whose descendants form the fine breed now characteristic of the country. The number of small proprietors diminished year by year, and the system of large estates became ever more general, although the oft-quoted dictum of Pliny, 'Latifundia perdidere Italiam,' refers to other parts of Italy and not to the Campagna. It was the taste for luxury and the distractions of city life which drew the small farmers towards Rome, while the extension of Roman rule to lands beyond the sea led to the establishment of the grain tribute from Sicily, Sardinia, and North Africa. This competition proved disastrous to Latian agriculture. In later years, when the power of the Empire declined, the grain imports from the provinces diminished, and agriculture had a chance of revival, but the removal of the capital to Constantinople and the heavy taxes imposed by the Eastern Emperors crushed the Campagna once more.

During the Empire a large part of the Campagna together with properties in other parts of Italy formed the *Patrimonium Caesaris* or Imperial domain; and out of this *Patrimonium* Constantine endowed the various *basilicae* of Rome with several estates, authorising private persons to follow his example (*Cod. Theodos.* XVI. 2). Thus was formed the nucleus of what was afterwards to become the vast patrimony of the Church. Favoured with privileges and exemptions, and as the only orderly institution surviving in the general dissolution of society, the Church contributed not a little to the partial repopulation of the Campagna. The whole territory was divided, for purposes of administration, into six parts, called *patrimonia*. These eventually became political divisions, and the *rectores* of the various *patrimonia* developed from bailiffs or estate managers into governors of provinces. Each *patrimonium* in turn was subdivided into estates or groups of estates, variously denominated *massae* and *fundi*; the headquarters of the

massae later became centres of population, and eventually grew into towns and communes.

Then came the barbarian invasions which spread desolation and ruin throughout Italy, and the Campagna suffered more than any other part of the country; for it surrounded the capital of the world, which was the ultimate bourn of the invaders. Paulus Diaconus, himself a Longobard, gives us a terrible picture of the state of the country at the time of the Longobard invasion in 593. 'The land is in complete 'solitude and no proprietor dwells among his fields. . . . Wild 'beasts are found where men formerly dwelt. The labourers 'have fled or have been killed, and the fields are abandoned.' The ruin of the ancient aqueducts and drainage system caused the dispersal of the waters, the formation of swamps, and consequently the recrudescence of malaria. Plague, earthquakes, and tempests were added to other terrors, so that the end of the world was believed to be imminent. In the ninth century the Campagna was again devastated by the raids of the Saracens.

One of the most interesting features of the history of the Campagna is the story of the efforts made by successive governments, and especially by various popes from the fifth century onwards, to revive agriculture in the plains round Rome. Already in classical times there were laws enjoining on landowners the cultivation of their estates on pain of confiscation in case of non-compliance (Aulus Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* IV. 2). Later on the constitutions of the Emperors Valentinian, Theodosius, and Arcadius (380 to 400 A.D., lex VIII., lib. XI., tit. LVIII., in C.J.C., *Cod. Just.*) provided that when a landlord left his estate uncultivated for a certain time he lost all rights to it in favour of the man who had farmed it. Other enactments of the same tendency were made by successive popes, who also attempted to restore cultivation on the lands held by the Church. The two main objects of the agricultural policy of the papacy from the fifth century down to our own times were the repopulation of the Campagna and the provision of a supply of wheat sufficient for the needs of the city. With the first object in view the popes Zacharias (741–752) and Adrian I. (772–795) instituted nine or ten agricultural settlements around Rome known as *domuscultae*. The first was established on

an estate along the Via Tiburtina, where Pope Zacharias built houses and a church and created a farm colony. It was in these colonies, according to Tomassetti, that the popes first exercised the Temporal Power, which they did not yet possess in Rome, and there they raised their first armed forces. Between the eighth and the ninth centuries we find a real agricultural revival, and in the deeds of donation of lands granted by the popes to various churches and monasteries mention is made of cultivation in places such as Astura, S. Maria di Galeria, Porto, etc., which were subsequently abandoned on account of malaria and are still almost uninhabited. The *domuscultae* might have exercised a lasting influence on the agricultural economy of the Campagna had not the civil wars and invasions of the eleventh century brought further ruin in their train.

With these wars coincides the rise of the Campagna barons, who seized many of the Church lands. In the place of the *domuscultae*, castles arose, built originally for defence against the Saracens, but eventually developing into feudal strongholds. The churches and monasteries, when deprived of their lands, sometimes contented themselves with a formal act of homage on the part of the usurping barons or the payment of a nominal tribute. Many estates thus continued to figure as Church lands, although really owned by some great feudatory, who was able to enjoy the privileges and exemptions granted to ecclesiastical property.

Yet, in spite of the devastation of the Campagna, Rome continued to be an important agricultural centre, and in the Middle Ages the Roman commune definitely claimed jurisdiction over the *districtus urbis*, a renascence of the ancient circumscription of the prefects, and almost coincident with the *Ducatus* of Rome. This communal authority, as will be presently seen, was contested on the one hand by the popes, who wished to acquire ever greater power over the resources of the city, and on the other by the barons of the Campagna. To secure the revival of farming the commune encouraged the agricultural *sodalitia*. The most powerful of these ancient corporations was the famous *Communitas* or *Universitas Bobacteriorum*, which had existed at least since 1088 and eventually came to represent the whole agricultural industry, exercising, conjointly with the merchants' guild, wide

jurisdiction within the State ; it was described as the ' nobilis ' ars bobacteriorum, quae semper sit in suo robore et firmitate ' pro pace et utilitate urbis.' The *bobacterii* were owners of cattle who rented land for grazing purposes or for farming, and may be regarded as the ancestors of the modern *mercanti di Campagna*. The authority which they exercised was such that in 1335 Pope Benedict XII. wrote from Avignon to their consuls and to those of the merchants, entrusting them with the task of composing the quarrels between the Colonna and the Orsini, and in 1368 Urban V. accepted the consulship of the *bobacterii* as an honour. Subsequently they were entrusted with a general reform of all the other guilds and with jurisdiction over all matters pertaining to agriculture. The Statutes of Rome of 1438 also deal with the position of the guild and establish grazing dues to be paid by cattle-owners to the *Dogana Pecudum* for the Apostolic Chamber or Papal Treasury. Roman citizens were, however, exempted from payment of these dues within the *districtus urbis*, an exemption afterwards extended to the people of Toscanella. Elaborate regulations for the transit of cattle and sheep from the mountain pastures to the Campagna, and *vice versa*, in autumn and spring were set forth in these statutes, and severe penalties were imposed on all who failed to respect the enactments or molested the owners of herds and flocks or their employees during transit.

On several occasions the Roman commune made a determined stand against both pope and baronage, and tried to enforce its authority over the Campagna and the *districtus urbis*. Between the middle of the thirteenth and that of the fourteenth century the baronage had been growing in power, until it seemed as though the whole of the Campagna and the adjoining territory were developing into an aggregate of small feudal sovereignties. One of the chief causes of quarrel between the commune and the barons was the attempt of the great feudal landlords to export grain, thus exposing the city to famine.

The Roman baronage owes its origin to various sources. Several of the great medieval families, such as the Frangipane, the Savelli, the Crescenzi, claimed descent from ancient Roman houses. Others, such as the powerful Counts of Tusculum, the Annibaldi, Orsini, and Capocci, derived their importance from the acquisition or seizure of land from the

Church, while the Prefetti of Vico and the Counts of Anguillara were descended from foreign adventurers. A peculiarity of these Roman feudatories, as Tomassetti was the first to point out, is that their jurisdiction radiated outwards from their palaces in Rome to their strongholds among the hills beyond the Campagna, their other castles and estates being echeloned along the road between the two, so that in case of civil strife they could summon their armed vassals from Marino, Colonna, Palestrina, Segni, etc. to their fortified dwellings in Rome, or, if danger were pressing in the city itself, retire to their mountain fastnesses. Thus, the Counts of Tusculum had their palace on the Palatine and a chain of possessions and castles along the Appian Way to Tusculum itself, while another line of their fiefs extended from the Frattocchie below Albano to Anzio and Monte Circeo. The Colonna branch of the same family had a palace on the Quirinal, castles at Colonna, Palestrina and Castel San Pietro, and a series of fortified posts across the intervening country. The Crescenzi-Savelli extended from the Aventine to Castel Savello, Albano, and Ariccia; the Orsini eventually followed the Crescenzi line along the Via Nomentana, and carved out for themselves a veritable military state in the Sabina, almost independent of the Papacy; while the great house of Conti had an even more important domain, centring at Poli, which they owed to their kinsman Pope Innocent III. (1198–1216). The popes availed themselves of these powerful barons as their sole means of ruling the Campagna, and granted feudal rights liberally, from the eleventh century onwards, but feudalism was first established on a firm basis by Adrian IV. and consolidated by Innocent III. Many of the great families owed the enlargement of their fiefs to nepotism; but the only house which derived its whole importance, beyond that which it had enjoyed locally, from a papal kinsman was that of the Caetani of Anagni, of whose fortunes Boniface VIII. was founder. On the other hand, families like the Frangipane, Annibaldi, and Capocci, who could boast of no papal relative, soon declined and died out. Within the city itself the barons had no legal right of jurisdiction, although they often committed deeds of violence and fought against each other. Their internecine warfare, their violence and turbulence helped to depopulate the Campagna, and they were commonly

described as imbued with a *Spiritus Diabolicus*. Yet we must not forget that they did grant some protection to farmers who came to live within the walls of their castles, conceded favours to churches and monasteries, and erected many splendid monuments. In the fourteenth century drastic measures were taken for the re-establishment of papal authority, and in 1354 the power of the barons to a great extent was broken by Cardinal Albornoz, the Legate of Pope Innocent VI. Some great families continued to exercise local jurisdiction down to the early nineteenth century, and even in our own times the Odescalchi at Bracciano, the Caetani at Sermoneta and Cisterna, and the Colonna at Paliano still wield considerable local influence.

By the end of the Middle Ages agriculture in the Campagna was more flourishing than the vicissitudes of that stormy period would lead one to suppose. This is attested by the remains of the many villas built at that period, the ' belle e ' piacevoli habitationi ' mentioned by Biondo. But the wars and invasions of the fifteenth century again brought devastation in their train. Tomassetti says that there were then 132 villages around Rome, of which only a few survive, such as Ostia (a recent revival), Isola Farnese, Mentana, San Vittorino, while many others, like Vaccareccia (Maccarese), Marco Simone, Castell' Arcione, and Lunghezza, are merely farms surrounded by a few cottages, outbuildings and huts.

It was probably about the beginning of the fifteenth century that, the landowners finding it simpler to devote their lands to grazing purposes, the Campagna became a vast pasture, with only a few oases of cultivation, and thus it remained until the partial revival of recent years. Half of the lands comprised within the jurisdiction of the *Dogana Pecudum* was rented with the object of providing Rome with its meat, milk, and cheese, and the income was paid into the *Camera Apostolica*. One of the chief anxieties of the Papal Government at this time was the fear lest the supply of food to the city should give out and famine ensue. Great importance was therefore attached to the operations of the Annona, an institution under the Cardinal Camerlengo for the maintenance of the grain supply. After the Council of Constance, as the condition of the Campagna became more deplorable and the people of Rome were suffering from famine,

Sixtus IV. (1471–84) determined to meet the emergency by enacting the first comprehensive agrarian law since classical times. The Sixtine reform was based on the law of Theodosius, Valentinian, and Arcadius ' de omni agro deserto et quando ' steriles fertilibus imponuntur.' In his *Constitutio* of the 1st of March 1476, Sixtus, after asserting that the famines were due less to the inclemency of the seasons than to the abandonment of the land, decreed that :

' it should be permitted to anyone who wished to plough and cultivate land in the territory of Rome, of the Patrimony of St. Peter in Tuscia, and of the provinces of Marittima and Campagna,* to break soil, plough and cultivate, according to proper seasons and customs, the third part of that estate which he had chosen out for the purpose of cultivation, whether it belonged to monasteries, chapters or other churches and pious foundations or to private persons, provided he asked permission of the owners, even though it were not granted to him,'

so long as the permission of certain magistrates appointed for the purpose was obtained. All landowners were enjoined, under threat of severe penalties, to allow farmers to cultivate the soil and gather the harvest without molestation, thus establishing the theoretical basis of papal policy in agricultural matters which has lasted down to recent times. This document was not an innovation, but rather a definite sanction of ancient custom, for from time immemorial the inhabitants of the States of the Church had enjoyed similar rights, although their exercise was often hindered by the usurpations of the barons, who converted to their own profit these encouragements to agriculture. They thus compelled their vassals to cultivate the baronial lands, bought up all the produce at a low price, stored it in their own warehouses, and resold at high prices what they did not consume.

To obviate these practices a whole series of measures aiming at the restriction of grain exports and the reduction of prices was enacted by successive popes, but seldom with success. Julius II. confirmed the Sixtine constitution, and

* Under the papal administration the province known as Campagna did not correspond to the country immediately round Rome but to the district of Frosinone. The Marittima, as the name implies, was the coast district.

other laws were decreed forbidding or hindering the export of wheat, but apparently without much result. Clement VI. made further attempts to encourage the cultivation of the Campagna, observing that if the owners found pasture and stock-raising more profitable than agriculture, yet it was more desirable that the land should produce food for men rather than for animals, that by the exercise of agriculture men born for labour would find an honest occupation, and that cultivation would improve the air and the climate—a statement confirmed by the latest scientific opinion and practical experience. But tillage continued to decline, while the upper classes, like their ancestors under the later Empire, preferred the luxuries of city life and the chances of lucrative Court appointments to a simple rustic existence in the Campagna, with the ever-present danger of fever.

At this period the *usi civici*, which probably existed even in much earlier times, began to assume peculiar importance in the social economy of the country. The barbarian invasions, the establishment of feudalism, perpetual warfare, and malaria having resulted in the abandonment of wide tracts of territory, the right of the few remaining inhabitants to these derelict lands came to be generally recognised. A letter of the Cardinal Camerlengo, Guido Ascanio Sforza, dated 1523, proves the existence of a public right to graze on each side of the high roads when flocks and herds were transmigrating from upland to lowland pastures or *vice versa*. This right lasted for many generations, and Sig. De Cupis states that old farmers have told him of the survival of similar rights early in the nineteenth century. A second factor was the custom whereby communes owning much land granted it to the farmers, but reserved the grazing rights for the whole community. Finally the tribute imposed by Paul III. in 1543 on the whole papal territory induced many landowners, instead of paying the tax directly, to cede the right of grazing on their property to the *municipia*. Near Rome there existed grazing servitudes, whereby the landowners were required to let their land lie fallow for two or three successive years, so that it might serve the community for pasturage. In 1849 the *usi civici* were abolished in the Campagna proper, but they survive in various other districts formerly within the Papal States, and are still a fertile source of agrarian disputes. The custom now

prevailing is for the landlord to cede the full ownership of a part of the land in exchange for the renunciation by the community of all rights over the rest.

Throughout the seventeenth century we note a series of ups and downs in the state of the Campagna, while the flow of legislative enactments in favour of tillage and for the maintenance of the city's food supply never ceased. During the pontificate of Urban VIII. (1623–44) an interesting experiment, the first of its kind in the Campagna, was made for the reclamation of a large estate at Ostia by means of labourers imported from Tuscany, where agriculture had achieved more progress. But the labourers all contracted malaria and the attempt was abandoned. It was revived two and a half centuries later, with the financial help of the late King Humbert, and after a series of failures and much suffering from fever a Romagnol colony has been established and is now prospering under the shadow of Antonio da San Gallo's castle. In the latter half of the eighteenth century Pius VI. (1775–1800) attempted the reform of agriculture on a general plan. He began by reconfirming the right of all farmers to cultivate the land without impediment, giving detailed instructions as to the best methods of agriculture, which were to be further explained by itinerant inspectors ;* landlords who failed to cultivate were to pay a fine equal to the presumable income which they would have derived from the land if they had cultivated it, and the amount of the fines was to be distributed among needy and deserving farmers. But even these drastic measures failed in their object, and in 1783 only about 70,000 acres were cultivated. The industrial survey of that year showed that the Campagna was divided into 362 estates, of which 234 belonged to laymen and the rest to the Church and other pious foundations. In 1798 the Annona went bankrupt for over three million scudi (£600,000). One defect of Campagna agriculture, which Pius VII. pointed out, was that not only did the landlords own too much land, but that even the *mercanti di Campagna* or large farmers were apt to rent more than they could manage, from mere vanity ; this contributed to maintain grazing

* This system is now adopted throughout Italy by means of the *Cattedre ambulanti di agricoltura*.

and to reduce both wheat-growing and the population, and to keep agriculture in a backward condition.

Two factors have contributed greatly to the depopulation of the Campagna—namely, brigandage and malaria, the one a memory of the past, the other still existing, though diminished in extent and virulence. A wild, thinly inhabited country, partly wooded, and intersected by deep ravines, with ruined buildings scattered about, and surrounding a great city, which even in its most ruinous days was always a world centre, offered admirable opportunities for the operations of freebooters. Throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance travellers in the Campagna were liable to be plundered by brigands. Highway robbery continued throughout the eighteenth century, increased during the Napoleonic wars and after the restoration, and was not entirely suppressed until the end of the nineteenth century.

Malaria undoubtedly existed in the Campagna in ancient times, as is attested by numerous allusions in the works of classical authors, and by the temples to the Dea Febris, but the Roman system of drainage held the disease in check. With the devastation which took place in the Middle Ages fever resumed its sway, but the depopulation was neither sudden nor uniform, and it was in the seventeenth century that the greatest exodus from the Campagna occurred. The discovery a few years ago that the disease could only be transmitted by means of the anopheles mosquito, and that that insect flourished in stagnant water, opened the way to a real solution of the problem. To protect the inhabitants of the Campagna by means of wire netting in every house has proved a practical impossibility in the majority of cases, but the distribution of quinine by the Red Cross and municipal doctors has given far better results, and the drainage works carried out on a number of estates have much reduced the breeding-grounds of the mosquito. During the last dozen years the number of malarial cases has greatly diminished, and fatal cases are now almost unknown. A recent report of the Italian Red Cross Society proves that the number of malarial cases in the Campagna dropped from 3060 in 1900 to 425 in 1910. The general condition of the population and the extension of a supply of good drinking water are also most important factors in relation to malaria, for impure

water and inadequate food render the body more liable to all forms of illness. It has further been observed that malaria comes in cycles, and that at the present we are apparently at the beginning of a non-malarial period. But if this respite is adequately utilised, the drainage works completed, and the existing population gradually cured of the disease, there should be no fear of the recurrence of a malarial phase.

Agricultural methods in the Latian plain have changed but little for many centuries, and it is only within the last few years that real progress has been made. Small properties exist, but the bulk of the land is still divided among a few large landowners, although their estates are inferior to those of Calabria and much smaller than English, Scotch, Austrian and Hungarian estates. The Campagna is now divided into 428 *tenute* of 600,000 acres in all, of which more than half belong to private landlords, mostly Roman nobles; 140,000 to land companies and banks; and 62,000 to hospitals and other pious foundations—in all about 240 proprietors, of whom fifty own over 2500 acres each. The largest landowner is the Roman hospital administration, which possesses about 25,000 acres, while the principal private landlord is Don Giovanni Torlonia (about 22,000 acres).

All save a few estates are rented to a class of large farmers known as *mercanti di Campagna*, who pay a fixed rental to the landlords and farm the estates themselves. The *mercante* lives in Rome or in some minor Latian town, and goes out to inspect his farms three or four times a week; he is usually a man of humble origin and plain manners, often an ex-sheep-owner from the mountains, with little education, but endowed with a shrewd business sense and possessed of a thorough knowledge of agriculture as it is practised in the Campagna. He is often more progressive in his ideas than the indolent princely landlord, who seldom visits his estates except when following the hounds or dashing across the Campagna in a motor.

The chief products of the land are wheat, Indian corn, oats, and hay, but the greater part of the area of the Campagna is still devoted to grazing. Large herds of cattle and horses roam about the country in the wild state, and, save on a few properties, are never stabled. Flocks of sheep descend into the plains from the pastures of the Latian highlands or the

Abruzzi in the autumn and return to the mountains in spring. The only permanent inhabitants of the Campagna are estate bailiffs, herdsmen, and mounted watchmen. The labourers, or *guitti*, as they are called, leave their mountain homes in the autumn, remain encamped in the Campagna for about ten months, and return to the mountains in the summer. Malaria rendered these migrations necessary in the past, but the custom has survived even in places which have become immune. During their residence in the plains the *guitti* live under the most primitive conditions, in straw huts or large dormitories, for they regard themselves as temporary inhabitants, although they actually spend the greater part of their lives in the Campagna. Nor do they always return to the same place every year, and even if they remain on one estate they are frequently shifted about from one end of it to the other, according as this or that section is farmed or left fallow. They have no security of tenure, for they do not contract directly with the farmer, but are engaged, usually in their own villages, by the *caporale*, a sort of primitive labour agent, who formerly fleeced them most unmercifully, taking toll of their wages and advancing them seed, foodstuffs, money etc. at exorbitant rates of interest. These abuses still survive, although they are diminished owing to the spread of education and the fact that the peasantry are becoming more conscious of their rights.

Wages in the Campagna are still very low. The labourers who are paid in cash receive from 1*s*. 3*d*. to 2*s*. a day. Where the *colonia* system is adopted, the peasant receives an allotment of land to cultivate and retains two-thirds of the crop, the rest going to the farmer, and he often earns extra wages by working on the estate as a day labourer. But the most fertile land is not usually given to the peasant, and there are many deductions and exactions from his share, while the custom of frequently changing his allotment prevents him from getting the best out of the land which he has improved by his labour. During the harvest season extra wages are paid, the haymowers earning as much as four shillings a day. A considerable number of these labourers own small plots of land near their native villages in the hills. Conditions are gradually changing, but they will not be radically improved until Campagna agriculture loses its temporary character—the

result of malaria and of the troubled history of the territory —and becomes recognised as a settled occupation for permanent inhabitants.

The centre of a Campagna estate is the *casale* or farmhouse, often a medieval castle with towers and battlements, on the site of some more ancient building. Around are granaries, barns, and other outbuildings, a *fontanile*, or large stone drinking-trough, and sometimes the huts or dormitories of the labourers. The general appearance of the *casali* and their surroundings is as a rule untidy and has an unfinished, temporary appearance, but the buildings themselves are often very picturesque. The deplorable condition of some of these fine castles and villas is but one of the consequences of the absenteeism of the Campagna landlords. With the disappearance of malaria and the extension of roads, railways, and tramways it is to be hoped that the landlords and farmers will come to inhabit their Campagna residences more and more, and that we shall see Lunghezza, Marco Simone, Passerano, Castel di Leva, Torre Astura, and other castles intelligently restored and becoming the centres of an active, useful, and agreeable country life.

In the last thirty years the Italian legislature has enacted many laws for the reclamation of the Campagna, but only within quite recent times, and especially since the law of 1905, have they begun to bear fruit. The improvement (*bonifica*) of all land within a radius of ten kilometres of Rome and in the Anio basin is obligatory, and loans at 2½ per cent. and exemptions from taxes are granted to landlords for improvement and reclamation works. Owners of estates beyond the ten-kilometre radius may enjoy the advantages of the law by applying for them. *Borgate rurali* or rural centres—a revival of the medieval *domuscultae*—have been established in two or three places, and others are projected. On the estates of Redicicoli and Bufalotta a farm colony is being created by the *Congregazione di Carità* of Rome for orphans, who will be brought up as agriculturists. Although many landlords are opposed to improvement because the existing system is profitable and entails no trouble, signs of progress are evident ; agricultural machinery is coming more and more into use, irrigation and drainage canals are being cut in all directions, and new buildings are rising rapidly. The straw huts have

been declared illegal within the territory of the Roman commune and are fast disappearing; in their place solid houses of brick or concrete have been built and others are in course of construction, in which every family occupies two or three rooms. Cow stables and barns of the latest improved type are also very numerous (indeed in many cases they preceded the dwellings for the labourers), and the system of stabling cattle is becoming more common. Even before these improvements began there had been a general rise in the value of Campagna land, and to-day even the unimproved parts are worth more than they were twenty or thirty years ago. The amount of land now under cultivation, according to the *Catastro Agrario*, is about 125,000 acres. The area devoted to wheat has not increased in recent times, as cattle and sheep raising is, at the present rate of prices, more profitable; * but lucerne and other crops are increasing, and all forms of cultivation are carried on by more scientific methods. The total population of the Campagna is about 40,000.

It is clear that there is room for a larger population and larger output, and the experiments made on certain improved and scientifically cultivated estates show what the Campagna is capable of producing. It is remarkable that on nearly all the improved estates the farmers are men from the north of Italy, and that, unlike the Roman *mercanti di Campagna*, they live on the land all the year round.

In consequence of the absence of fixed settlements, the labourers' children have hitherto been wholly without education. There are schools in their native villages, but they are closed in the summer when the *guitti* are at home, while in the Campagna, where these migratory labourers spend ten months of the year, there were until a few years ago no schools, for the Rome municipality did not undertake to provide schooling for those who were not natives of the Roman commune. But a private society, the *Società per le Scuole dell' Agro Romano*, founded by a group of earnest

* Emigration to America has brought about a large demand for sheep's cheese by Italian emigrants in the United States and the Argentine and doubled the price; this has resulted in an increase of the rent of Campagna land on which sheep graze, and is unfavourable to the extension of wheat production.

educationalists who had devoted themselves to studying the needs of the Campagna, is now supplying the deficiency. It has spread a network of some sixty schools over a large part of the Campagna and Pontine Marshes, overcoming many apparently insuperable obstacles, and bringing not only education but civilization to the poor *guitti*, for whom the school is a centre of light and leading.

All these different forces—improved farming, drainage, the Red Cross work, education, means of communication—are transforming the Campagna, in spite of the opposition of vested interests. The old picturesque life is passing away. The great herds of long-horned cattle and the droves of wild horses roaming over vast expanses of deserted country, tended by the *butteri*, who are among the finest horsemen in the world, the lonely *casali*, the primitive customs, the wild riot of undergrowth in the forests of Maccarese and Nettuno, cannot long withstand the onward march of progress, and much of the old charm is bound to disappear. But much will still remain ; the exquisite views of rolling plain encircled by blue and violet mountains, the golden glow of the sun rising over the sheets of white mist in autumn, the marvellous ever-changing hues of the land itself, the opal haze of the Alban and Sabine ranges, these nothing can destroy. We can only hope that the giant aqueducts will be carefully preserved as heretofore, and that the lonely frowning towers of the feudal age and the princely villas of the Renaissance will be restored where restoration is necessary. Above all, the memory of the past, so rich in great events and so intricate in the variety of its phases, cannot be effaced, and every stone will continue to remind us of Roman armies marching out to victory, of barbarian invaders and Saracen pirates plundering and destroying, of the wars of popes, emperors, *condottieri* and feudal barons, of the splendid retinues of cardinals and nobles, of the poetry and art which this territory has inspired from the earliest times. And for that which is bound to go we shall have in exchange a more flourishing land, a larger and more prosperous population of sturdy farmers, like those who formed the sinews of the armies of ancient Rome.

Luigi Villari.

SOME ASPECTS OF WEST AFRICAN RELIGIONS

1. **The Divine Mystery.** By ALLEN UPWARD. Garden City Press. 1913.
2. **From the Congo to the Niger and the Nile.** By the DUKE OF MECKLENBURG. Duckworth. 1913.
3. **Collection de Monographies Ethnographiques.** By M. CYR VAN OVERBERGH. 13 vols. Brussels. Official; still under issue.
4. **Les Bushongo.** Par E. TORDAY et T. A. JOYCE. Brussels.
5. **Die Pangwe.** Von GÜNTER TESSMANN. Berlin. 1913.
6. **Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection.** By Dr. E. WALLIS BUDGE. Philip Lee Warner. 1911.

THE last thirty years have brought vast additions to our knowledge of primitive man. First, excavations of ancient sites in Egypt, Babylonia, and Crete have revolutionised our ideas as to the customs and religions of old-world peoples; while, secondly, the study of present-day tribes, still living under archaic conditions, has thrown a flood of light upon ancient ceremonies and beliefs, the meaning of which had hitherto been hidden.

Possibly the richest field for ethnological research still awaiting attention will be found in the vast, all-but unstudied stretches of Western Africa, where peoples of varying degrees of culture may yet be met, ascending and descending the ladder of civilisation, there complete, or nearly so, in all its lower rungs. There is, moreover, good reason to suspect the existence of a direct connexion between existing religions in West Africa and the civilisation of the ancient Egyptians. According to Dr. Wallis Budge, 'There was a common ancestor 'tribe from which the Egyptians and other Sudani folk got 'all their essential knowledge about religion, and their most 'valuable beliefs'; while Professor Flinders Petrie states that 'Osiris worshippers always regarded the West as sacred 'and blessed, and probably, therefore, it was the home-land 'whence the Osiris tribes came into Egypt; the dead are 'laid facing the West, according to the custom of looking

'to the home-land familiar among other races.' * Surely, then, it is worth while to look to the West for the last rays of light on many an ancient problem, before the sun of such old-world lore sinks beneath the waves of modern civilisation. Nor is there any time to be lost. In many parts of West Africa the younger generation is so rapidly becoming christianised that soon the old beliefs and customs will have altogether faded from the face of the earth.

To the importance of forming records of these disappearing faiths the authorities of the Belgian Congo have shown themselves fully awake, and the collection of 'Monographies Ethnographiques' published by M. Cyr van Overbergh is invaluable to the student, both for the matter contained in it and for the perfection of its scientific arrangement. To the Belgian Government also we owe the publication of that magnificent work 'Les Bushongo' by E. Torday and T. A. Joyce (of the British Museum). The French and Germans appear equally alive to the value of such records, and the recent excellent monograph on 'Die Pangwe,' by Günter Tessmann, is deserving of the highest praise. In our own country the present Secretaries of State, both for the Colonies and for India, have clearly impressed upon officials working abroad the importance of studying peoples entrusted to their charge, and could each new fact be recorded and forwarded to some central authority at home our knowledge would make vast strides. Though the strain of work thus added to the weight laid upon the shoulders of those whose lives are spent in tropical lands would be heavy, it would bring its own reward in the shape of discoveries of unexpected charm and interest.

The study of the strange faiths dating back to the childhood of the world, yet still surviving among West African natives, is like the reading of some ancient Saga. To the West African the commonplace does not exist: each object is tinged with wonder and mystery, while forces, beneficent or malignant, are to be felt on every hand. Everything, from the smallest stone or humblest plant to the mightiest rock, river, or tree, has an indwelling soul or 'Mana,' which

* See also 'Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway,' p. 501, Professor Elliott Smith.

is capable of projecting itself in a multitude of ways in order to influence the lives of those with whom it comes in contact.

West African beliefs may be divided into two great systems —namely those of the Bantu, and those of the earlier non-Bantu, tribes. Of the latter, the inhabitants of the Coast regions seem to be the most ancient, not only from the evidence of language, but also because such would, in all probability, have been driven ever further seaward by successive waves of invasion, of which the Bantu formed the latest and probably the furthest reaching. If indeed, as Migeod holds,*—though the great authority of Sir H. H. Johnston is opposed to this view—the Bantu invaders once swept over the whole of West Africa, the great similarity of belief is readily understandable.

The doctrine of the immortality of the soul and reincarnation seems common to most West African peoples, while belief in a supreme God, either with a feminine counterpart or uniting in himself both male and female attributes, appears once to have been practically universal, though now in many cases almost forgotten, save by a small band of initiates. Such deities are looked upon, in general, as but little concerned with the lives of earth-folk. Of these vague, far-off divinities 'Kabedya Mpungu,' of the Baholoholo people (Belgian Congo), may be taken as typical. 'Ce Dieu . . . est là-haut, 'très loin. C'est un être vague, qui ne s'occupe pas des vivants, 'qui reste à l'arrière-plan du culte comme de la croyance.' † Very similar is the Yoruba belief in 'Olorun'; that of the Ewe people in 'Mawu'; and that of the Bushongo in their all-powerful creator, 'Chembe.'

Possibly these vague deities were once looked upon as more nearly allied to their earth-children, as is still the case in Southern Nigeria, among the semi-Bantu Ekoi, and, to a certain extent, also amid the purely negro Ibibios. The principal deities of the Ekoi are the Earth-God 'Obassi 'Nsi,'—anciently regarded as a goddess—and the Sky-God 'Obassi Osaw,' Lord of the Heavenly Host and of Lightning. With change of sex, these are the exact counterparts of the earliest known Egyptian deities—the feminine Heaven, Nūt,

* F. W. H. Migeod, 'The Languages of West Africa,' vol. ii. p. 303.
† Monographies Ethnographiques, ix. p. 285.

and the masculine Earth, Geb, who are figured in a primitive drawing where the starry Goddess of Heaven may be seen overarching the reed-covered Earth. Shu (space) kneels between, supporting the goddess, while over her back rises and sets the boat of Ra.

Among most West Coast tribes, as amid Northern nations and the peoples of the Mediterranean, the supreme deity usually appears to possess, among other attributes, lordship over the thunder and lightning. This is the case with 'Bobowissi,' the chief god of the Southern Gold Coast tribes, and with 'Nyomno' of the Gãs; and the name of the Ibibio god, 'Obumo,' is obviously derived onomatopoeically from the roll of thunder. It is interesting to note that among the Niam-Niams the word for divinity itself is Gumbah, or lightning. To quote that erudite and original work 'The 'Divine Mystery' by Mr. Allen Upward:

'It would seem clear that celestial science began with the clouds and not the stars. When the men above first took shape in the imagination of men below, they inhabited the clouds. The rain-cloud Indra is the foremost figure in the old Vedic pantheon of the Hindus. The Scandinavian Thor or Thuna is older than Odin, and his attributes clothe Zeus and Jove.'

For months after the present writer had begun to study the religion of Nigerian Ibibios, he was informed, by all classes and on every hand, that Obumo was the head of their pantheon. Later, however, accident brought to light the fact that behind and above this deity looms the dread figure of Eka Abassi (Mother of God)—at once mother and spouse of Obumo—the Great First Cause and Creatrix of all, from the Thunder God himself to the least of living things. To quote the Ibibio expression, spoken with hushed reverence, as was every mention of her, 'She is not as the others. 'She it is who dwells alone, on the other side of the wall.'

The connexion between the Mother Creatrix and the Thunder God is thus explained by Mr. Allen Upward:

'The child-bearing woman was as mysterious as the thunder-bearing man, and only less wonderful because she was more common. The birth of the child appeared to the primitive mind an act of creation, in which the mother played the part of the First Cause; so that in many old mythologies, and in some versions of the Kalevala Lays themselves, the world is created by a Great Mother, instead of the Word of Might.'

In a word, like Isis and Ilmatar of the Kalevala, 'Eka Abassi' was the Great World-Mother, the source whence sprang gods and men, the harvest and all living creatures, the personification of the feminine creative power. Like Isis also, Eka Abassi is connected with the moon, which; according to Ibibio folk-lore, she sent to earth in the shape of a great white bird, bearing her gift of fruitfulness to mankind.

Mother of Gods and men, Eka Abassi looms misty and vast, at the very fount of Ibibio religion; but her fame and worship have, of late, been so eclipsed by that of her son that, save to a small band of initiates, the very memory has all-but passed away. To none now living does the name of the goddess appear to have come down; possibly only to the innermost circle of priests was it ever known. In the same way the secret name of Ra was kept—'Hidden in my body 'since my birth, that no magician might acquire power over 'me'—only to be extorted, in the end, by Isis, through the bite of the magic serpent.

Eka Abassi may also be compared with Io, the supreme deity of the Maoris, whose existence has lately been re-discovered by Mr. Elsdon Best. This goddess cannot be invoked in connexion with evil matters: she was never born and will not know death. According to Mr. Best, the name of Io was deemed so sacred that it was never uttered, even by the high-class priests, except when absolutely necessary. At all other times this deity was alluded to as 'The Beyond' or 'The High 'One' or by some such term.*

According to the esoteric teaching handed down to a little band of initiates, from times when her cult was as yet unobscured by the parasitical growths of Fetish and Juju worship, some fragment of this Great Mother dwells in all existing things; and of her might be quoted the words, so long hidden from the light of day: 'Cleave the log, and thou 'shalt find Me. Break the stone, and there am I.' Most nearly of all does Eka Abassi manifest herself in sacred waters, or under the guise of unhewn stones, in the vicinity of holy pool or grove. All young children born in West Africa are sent by her, no matter through what gateway of lesser Jujus they may pass; while, of dead folk, save those

* 'Maori Religion,' by Elsdon Best, in 'Man,' vol. 8, art. 57.

who met their end through ill-will, by witchcraft, matchet-stroke, or other act of violence, the people say 'Eka Abassi 'has taken our brother.'

Most of the places where Eka Abassi dwells are connected with the worship of her son and spouse Obumo. In more than a score of Ibibio sacred groves, which the present writer with his wife and sister-in-law were the first and only Europeans privileged to visit, the following objects were found:

1. Mats of plaited palm leaf, said to represent the rainbow, and, when fringed, rainbow and lightning combined; thus typifying the two main seasons of the year, namely, the dry weather and the tornado, or rainy time.

2. Pots of water, i.e. ghost offerings, representing the Spirit World in general, and the Ancestors in particular.

3. Seeds and parts of trees, signifying the powers of procreation, and the forces latent in vegetation. Sometimes, too, there is a sacred tree of giant size, the spirit of which is looked upon as a powerful protector.

4. Shells of the genera *Voluta* and *Fasciolaria*, of a species as yet undetermined by science. These are sacred to the Spirit of the Sea, 'because one can always hear the sound of 'her waves in them.' For the same reason all sea shells are sacred in varying degree, and some fresh-water ones, since the latter belong to the Naiads of rivers and streams.

5. A little hut, representing the family, hearth, home and wedded love.

6. Parts of fishes, skulls and vertebrae of crocodiles, feathers of white birds, and skulls and horns of bush-beasts, signifying life and movement in water, air, and on earth.

7. Holy stones or rocks, in conjunction with pool, lake, or earth itself—all typifying motherhood.

8. A legendary python set to guard the waters, a leopard appointed to the same office by land, and a fish eagle, hovering, protective, in the clear air above.*

In connexion with the tutelary pythons to be found near so many West African shrines, it is interesting to remember that the throne of Osiris was guarded by a giant serpent.

The seemingly disconnected objects to be found in such

* Cf. Mr. R. E. Dennet's 'A Common Basis of Religion,' Journal of the African Society, April 1913.

holy places are all parts of a complicated symbolism. Obumo the Thunderer is not only looked upon by present-day Ibibios as the greatest deity, but the All-Father, from whom everything which exists has sprung. His home is in the sky, and, as he is too far off to trouble much about the smaller concerns of men, he leaves these in the hands of lesser powers, reserving to himself the ordering of the great events of the year, such as the proper division of the seasons.

The dry months are regarded as the time of barrenness and unrequited desire. If an Ibibio man wishes to express dislike of a woman, he nearly always uses the word ' dry ' as a term of disparagement towards her. In due course, the first rains begin to fall, slaking the thirst of the parched earth. Soft mists enfold her, and, from their gentle embrace, her barrenness turns into fruition. A stirring and quickening, hardly perceptible at first, but growing ever stronger, makes itself felt. Seeds germinate and spring forth to new life. Young leaves spread over all their veil of fresher, tenderer green ; while yams, plantains, and new corn swell and ripen to nourish the children of men.

Water, Earth, and Stone—the three Great Mothers—are almost always to be found within the grove of the All-Father. Each of these is thought to symbolise a different phase of motherhood. The first, for instance, may perchance be looked upon as a representation of the Ibibio Aphrodite. She is all that is soft and alluring, while the fish which teem in her waters are the sign of boundless and inexhaustible fruitfulness. She never grows old nor parched, neither may she be roughly used, burnt by fire, nor torn and cut by hoe and spade, as is the case with her homelier sister the Earth. This second member of the trilogy may best be described as the working mother. She it is who produces the crops to nourish her children in life, and provides their last, long resting-place, when work is done.

The significance attached to stones is less obvious, and it is naturally hard to induce primitive peoples to explain their fundamental ideas on such subjects. Even when they make the attempt their notions must still seem confused and unconnected, because so few of us can grasp the lines of thought which, for them, supply the necessary link. But in this region of alluvial swamps, where, save in the beds of a few streams,

even a pebble can hardly be found, probably all stones were believed, like so-called 'thunderbolts,' to have come down from the sky, and it seems not over-fanciful to think that they represented woman in her third and most dignified capacity as Consort, the sharer of dignities and rights.

Throughout West Africa, below the chief deities, crowd a multitude of lesser powers, some of them probably deified ancestors. These vary in importance from elementals, so strong as to hold almost the position of demi-gods, to the spirits of tree, stone, or metal—most of which may be grouped under the term 'Juju.' These minor powers are divided into two classes, beneficent or malignant, named by the Efiks respectively 'Idemm' (or 'Ndemm) and 'Mbiam.'

The cult of Juju, together with ancestor worship, forms the dominant influence in the lives of West African peoples, and enters into almost every thought and action. With both cults the secret societies existing all along the coast are closely bound up, and it is during their initiatory rites that the chief religious mysteries are revealed. Among the most typical of these societies are 'Egbo' and 'Akpambe,' whose power extends from the eastern part of Southern Nigeria into the South Kamerun; 'Idiong,' 'Ekkpo 'Njawhaw' and 'Ekong,' the three principal societies among the Ibibios; the Porro and Bundu of Sierra Leone; and, finally, the dreaded Mendi, or Human Leopard, Society with its sister cult of the Human Alligator. Membership in all of these, save the Bundu, is now confined to men; though nearly all were once exclusively feminine institutions, as are the Bundu and 'Nimm' to the present day.

This fact was brought to my knowledge by a fortunate accident. One evening, while collecting information concerning the funeral rites of Efik Chiefs holding high rank in the Egbo Society, my informant, himself a member of the highest grade, casually mentioned that when the Egbo spirit fled the town, as often happened after the death of an important member, the surviving members were sometimes forced to seek aid from an ancient woman of one of the ruling families in order to induce him to return. Her call the Spirit nearly always heeded, after having refused to listen to that of any man. The necessity for thus calling in the help of a woman seemed strange in a society the chief rites of which women

are forbidden to witness under penalty of death. After considerable hesitation on the part of my informant, careful inquiries brought out the unexpected explanation that the custom arose *because Egbo was originally a woman's society, till the men, weary of the dominance of the weaker sex, won from them its secrets, learnt the rites, and then, after having killed the leaders, forbade all women to participate in the mysteries for evermore.* At the present day, some of the more important women are occasionally elected as honorary members, but the deeper secrets of the cult are never revealed to them.

In the Egbo Society there are seven grades. To the highest of these, 'Nkanda, no white man has ever been admitted, though several have joined the lower ranks. Those members who have reached the four higher grades, and have paid full entrance fees, may take part in the Mariba or Etem-i-'Ngbe (Bush Leopard) ceremony. This may only be performed in the depths of the forest, and under conditions of the greatest secrecy, so that only the initiated may witness the successive mysteries which are then unveiled. It is difficult to discover more than the merest fragments of the secrets of Egbo, as any known informant would meet with a speedy death. But, from what has been gleaned, there seems to be a close resemblance between these secrets and the Eleusinian and ancient Egyptian mysteries, and only too many proofs have been given that some of the powers of Nature are known and utilised by initiates in a way forgotten or unknown to their white rulers. The importance of the society is speedily obvious even to the most casual visitor to any land where it has gained a foothold, for the Club House is the principal building in every town. Under native rule it usurped practically all functions of government, made trade almost impossible for non-members, and exercised a deep influence on the religious and mystic side of the people. The name of this powerful society is probably one form of the various West African names for the most dreaded denizen of the bush, the leopard.

' Leopard Societies ' are to be found throughout West Africa, the most notorious of all being the Human Leopard Society of Sierra Leone. This society, with its less-known sister cult of the ' Human Alligator,' extends to the Sherbro Islands. Its fetish, now called Borfima, is the most powerful influence

throughout the region which it has made its own. The fetish is usually formed of a calabash, sometimes round, at others elongated, or else of a small leathern bag. These objects, together with native pots, round or oval, are regarded throughout the West Coast as feminine symbols, while the word Ma is in general use both for 'woman' and 'mother.' It seems probable, therefore, that the original name of the society was Borfi Ma, i.e. Mother Borfi, and that it was once a cult for the acquiring of offspring—the underlying reason for so many African rites. Almost everywhere throughout the West Coast, the leopard appears to be associated with motherhood. As already mentioned, among Ibibios, a mythical leopard shares with the python the guardianship of sacred Pools and Groves, to which come young wives and barren women to pray that a babe may speedily be sent to bless their hearths, while the King of Benin was supposed to be joined to a leopard in mystic spousals.

In 1903 a Mendi carrier, who considered himself under some obligation to me, gave, under promise that he should in no way suffer from his confession, a certain amount of information concerning the Human Leopard Society. He asserted that it was older than was generally believed, that the office of Chief of one of the principal Lodges had been hereditary in his family for three generations, and that his great-grandfather stated that several priests were known to have held the post before him. My informant called my attention, with considerable show of mystery, to the shape of his skull, which, he said, had been artificially altered by binding pieces of wood on either side; and that this was done, soon after birth, by the mothers of those in direct line of succession to the chieftainship of the society. He also stated that the terrible rites were a matter of necessity, for, unless renewed from time to time, by means of parts taken from the bodies of human victims, the strength of Borfi Ma would ebb away, and she would no longer be able to bestow 'plenty piccans' upon her worshippers.*

Another very important society is the Idiong. The initiatory ceremonies of this society are said to bear a strong

* The idea of the renewal of power by means of sacrifice is world-wide. See Frazer, 'The Golden Bough.'

resemblance to those of Freemasonry. The rites extend over several weeks, and are held in the 'Sacred Bush,' the Club House, and the home of the aspirant's father.* At the first ceremony a cock is sacrificed, in order to signify to the deity the desire of the candidate to enter the society. Next, libations of palm wine are made, and the priest then rises and chants :

'Thou, Idiong, art our God. Thou hast the power to give life. We beg thee, therefore, to bless this earth-child with long life, for he enters thy Guild to-day.'

For the third offering a goat is sacrificed, and part of its flesh is strewn upon the ground ; after which the priest calls in a loud voice :

'Ancestors ! Ancestors ! Company of Idiong ! Come, eat, and let this man see Idiong.'

After a pause he continues :

'If vultures come, that is a sign your Father is pleased at heart because you wish to join Idiong. Should God Idiong not be pleased with you, then the vultures will be unable to come forth.'

Should the birds not appear, he adds after a while :

'Go home and offer sacrifice, that the anger of Idiong may be appeased.'

If at first unsuccessful, the offering must be repeated at intervals of eight days until the vultures at length appear. So soon as the first is seen winging his way towards the sacrifice, a glad shout is raised : 'Lo ! Our Fathers are coming !' While the birds feed, the candidate is rubbed over with yellow 'ogokk' powder. Then the priest stands forth holding a yam-pounder in his right hand, while, with his left, he takes that of the aspirant and announces very solemnly, 'I am 'about to kill you.'

After a pause he continues : 'Close your eyes.' Next, amid breathless silence, slow-falling, come the words : 'Thou 'art dead.'

Almost immediately, the other members seize the wrists

* Much of the information concerning the ceremony about to be described was kindly supplied by Mr. Eakin, of the Kwa Ibo Undenominational Mission.

of the supposed corpse, drag him to the local Club House, fling him to the ground and cover him with a burial cloth : then sit sadly around as if mourning the dead. Presently a plantain stem—the African ' Tree of Life '—is struck seven times upon the ground at the feet of the pretended dead, he slowly revives, and a feast is given to strengthen the ' new-born.'

Later, the company returns to the Sacred Bush. The most solemn moment of all has now arrived. The Chief Priest disappears amid the trees, where the shadows lie darkest, and returns, walking very slowly, holding a skull in his outstretched hands. All present raise shouts of joy at the sight : ' Idiong ' has come ! We have seen him ! ' The skull is then presented to the new member with the words :

' This is your God. Within this, Idiong dwells. He will give you power to see into the other world, and to know the cause of sickness, and of all trouble.'

The skull is then borne home, to be reverently deposited in the shrine built to receive it.

On the ensuing ' Idiong Sunday:' the last rite of the long series is performed, namely that of the ' Opening of the ' Eyes.' For this, the new member stands in the centre of a ring of spectators. Seven circles, called the ' Seven Steps,' are drawn upon the ground, and as the man places his foot in each the Head Priest passes a knife over his right eye, pretending to cut it open. The blood of a sacrificed cock is poured over the head of the neophyte, so that it flows across the eye, and thus gives verisimilitude to the ceremony. On placing his foot within the seventh circle, the aspirant cries aloud ' Now I see ! ' and repeats some vague prophecy which the priest whispers into his ear. The ' First Ring,' or Idiong Crown, is then placed upon his head, and he is admitted into the privileges of the lowest grade. The cost of entry to the higher grades of Idiong, like those of Egbo, is very heavy, and sometimes men are known to sell wives or children in order to raise the necessary sum.

The society claims the power of divination for its members, who retire to the Idiong shrine in order to converse with the Shades of Ancestors. Such a shrine, belonging to Chief Inaw of Ikotobo, the present writer was permitted to visit. Beyond the threshold of sun-baked clay, in which the skull of an

anthropoid ape was imbedded as a charm against evil influences, was a dark little chamber, containing carved figures—the 'Imagines Majorum' of the Chief—among them those of his father and mother. Behind these, a low door led into an inner shrine, where, Inaw declared, he was privileged to hold communion with the spirits of his ancestors. He told how, on one occasion, he had been enraged against an enemy, and had called upon his father's ghost to advise him as to obtaining vengeance. The Shade appeared, but only repeated 'Do not 'kill! Do not kill!' in so solemn a voice that Inaw dared not disobey, but obediently gave up all thoughts of revenge. The man's tones, hushed and reverent, like those of one speaking in some great cathedral, were such as to impress any unbiased hearer with the sincerity of his belief in these spirit visitants.

One of the most mysterious and powerful of Ibibio secret societies is that of Ekkpo 'Njawhaw, i.e. 'Ghosts—the 'Destroyers.' The word Ekkpo means not only 'ghosts' but also 'devils.' And just as behind the whole Ibibio pantheon looms the awful figure of the 'Great Mother,' so behind the cult of Ekkpo 'Njawhaw stands the still more terrible presence of Eka Ekkpo—Eka Abassi's dread counterpart—the source of evil, the death-bringer and fount of terror. Therefore, among these rude Ibibios, where woman is regarded as the mere slave of man, and one would least look for recognition of her power, we find motherhood, immaculate and alone, a virgin birth, recognised as the source of the powers both of light and of darkness, of good and evil, of life and death—the Zoroastrian Ormuzd and Ahriman.

Terrible indeed to look upon is this mother of Ekkpo 'Njawhaw. Often of colossal size, ill proportioned, and coal-black in colour, she looms from out the darkness at the back of her son's shrine, surrounded with the dreadful insignia of the cult, and with arms outstretched as if to welcome fresh victims. Around her flat mis-shapen feet lie skulls, some new and ivory-tinted, some blackened with the smoke of many sacrifices, and others carved from solid blocks of wood, with astonishing care and fidelity. Two sons she has, Akpan 'Njawhaw, the first-born, and Udaw, the second-born: also two daughters, Adiaha the elder, and Angwa-Angwa the younger.

At the planting of farms the lesser rites of the cult are carried out; the greater ones take place at the New Yam Festival. Eight days before the first of the new season's crops may be eaten, in any town where this society has established itself, the images are carried forth, in solemn procession, and set up in the public square. Should a native chance to meet these fetishes upon the road, he would at once look to see whether the mask of the goddess showed one ear or two. In the latter case there might be a chance of life; but in the first, entreaty would be useless, for with only one ear she cannot listen to anyone. Without both ears, she is like the Babylonian deities recorded in the Utukki Limnûti:

> 'Knowing neither mercy nor pity,
> They hearken not to prayer nor supplication.'

Should a woman chance to witness an Ekkpo 'Njawhaw play, no matter how unwillingly, a member, robed in the dress of the Cult Executioner, creeps after the poor woman, 'softly, 'softly,' and her life pays for the unwilling trespass.

Ekong, the Ibibio War God, had also no father, but sprang, in full strength, from beneath the heart of a virgin. A curious custom connects the burial rites of this society with those practised at Bigongji in the South Kamerun, as described and sketched by one of the members of the Duke of Mecklenburg's expedition. In this sketch the dead Chief Djaolo is depicted sitting in a chair with his right hand tied by a cord to the roof-beam. In the same way, when one of the principal men of the Ekong Society dies, he is set upon a chair in a room prepared for the purpose, and round the right wrist a long strip of white cloth is tied. This is fixed to the roof-beam, and close to the place where it is knotted a bell and a live cock are hung. At burial the body is placed in the grave, upon its back, with the arm stretched up at right angles and held in this position by the strip of cloth, while the earth is carefully filled in around it. It seems that the end of the strip was formerly left above ground, pegged into the earth. This is often omitted at the present day, and the reason for the custom seems to have been forgotten. It is, however, explained by a similar rite recorded by Dr. Wallis Budge in his 'Osiris':

'Among the Moro a ligament of bark was tied to the little finger of the left hand, and the other extremity was drawn to the surface and there attached to a peg driven into the ground. This was to enable the dead man to communicate with his children.'

Another powerful secret society is the Moon Cult 'Sso' among the Pangwe, of which a full description is given by Herr Tessmann in 'Die Pangwe.' Sso men are painted white in imitation of the moonbeams, and the masks of the society are horned to represent both the crescent moon and the So antelope, its representative on earth. During the initiatory ceremonies, a goat, previously rendered voiceless, is sacrificed and its flesh is torn apart and devoured. Traces of the Moon Cult are to be found among many West African tribes, such as the Bantu Ababua, and the negroes of the Gold Coast. Herr Tessmann thinks that the word Sso or So is connected with an older root Si, which is used among many Bantus for the moon, and is possibly related to the Egyptian 'Isis' and the Babylonian 'Sin.' It is interesting to notice that in the 'Shadow Plays' of this society the performers, whether masked or unmasked, are called 'Isis 'Men.'

One of the Duke of Mecklenburg's party stumbled upon this cult among the Bules, but, as he was merely passing through the country, he could not extract much information concerning it. To students of African religions, the chief value of the Duke's excellently illustrated book lies in the fact that members of the expedition took pains to record incidents, whether or not it was possible to ascertain their meaning. Readers can thus trace the existence of cults in regions where they were hitherto unknown.

Of purely feminine secret societies, the great Ekoi guild of Nimm may be taken as typical. According to legend, a divine woman came down to earth in order to teach its mysteries to her human sisters. This is also asserted of the famous Egbo society. The goddess shows herself sometimes in crocodile form, sometimes in that of a huge serpent. Eggs and oval stones are sacred to her, as they are to Eka Abassi among the Ibibios. The chief object of the rites of both deities is, like that of so many West African cults, the promotion of fertility.

To people such as these, birth is not to be explained by

physical causes alone, but rather as the 'in-breathing' of Nature Forces. For, among most West Coast tribes, while the body of the new-born is clearly attributed to physical causes, its spirit is thought to be that of some 'affinity' with which one of its parents was mysteriously linked, or of some ancestor, whose soul was awaiting reincarnation in one of the holy groves, pools, or trees, to which women go to pray for offspring. In this belief the majority of West Africans seem to stand midway between Central Australians and the Banks Islanders.*

Last year the present writer was fortunate enough to discover some score or more of such holy places, of which the pool of Isemin, in the Eket district of Southern Nigeria, may be taken as typical.

The path to the holy pool passes beneath an archway of overhanging boughs, under leafage so thick as to produce a soft green twilight. Thither, at the New Yam Festival, the women and girls of the countryside go in procession at dawn and pass 'naked as the breeze' to bathe in the stream. All men must keep within doors during this rite, since, should one be found hiding in the bush at such a time, native law condemns him to death. This practice was explained by a woman informant in language which showed a clearer conception than is usually formulated in the primitive mind:

'As a bride on her wedding night yields herself to the will of her new-made lord, so, at harvest time, maids and matrons present themselves before the great Juju Isemin, unrobed and awaiting his will, that perchance he may enter within those whom he chooses: thus shedding the blessing of fertility upon our town.'

West Africans, in general, believe in a minimum of three souls inhabiting the physical body: (1) the astral, which roughly resembles the Egyptian Ka, and is called Kra on the Gold Coast; (2) the shadow soul, corresponding to the Egyptian Ba; and (3) the one which most nearly approaches our idea of the true Ego, and corresponds to the Egyptian Khu. Of these, the last named is the only immortal one.

All over West Africa, more especially in the centre and north, burial customs existed till yesterday, and are probably

* On this point, Mr. Walter Heape, F.R.S., makes some acute observations in his interesting and original work 'Sex Antagonism.'

not yet quite stamped out, which strongly resemble those of pre-dynastic Egypt, both in the shape of the grave and the custom of burying victims, slaughtered or alive, with the dead chief, that he might not arrive alone and unattended in the spirit world, which is thought to be an almost exact replica of existence upon earth.

Among the Ibibios, every chief's memorial is provided with a little 'Ka' chamber, like the Egyptian 'Serdab,' and also with figures of the dead man, and of his favourite wives and slaves, corresponding to the old Ushabtiu.

It is to the astral soul, or Ka, that offerings of food and drink are made, to induce it to rest content in the grave and not return to earth to trouble the living. In West Africa, as among the ancient Babylonians, the ghosts of the unburied dead are greatly feared, and the list given in Tablet 4 of the Babylonian Utukki Limnŭti of those ghosts who are most dreaded would equally serve on the West African coast to-day :

'A ghost unburied,
Or a ghost that none careth for,
Or a ghost with none to make offerings,
Or a ghost with none to make libations,
Or a ghost that hath no posterity,
Or a woman that hath died in travail,
Or a woman that hath died with a babe at the breast.' *

The shadow soul, on the other hand, is the one most easily affected by witchcraft. The man himself can be killed by means of injury done to his shadow, such as flinging a dagger into it as he passes by. According to many tribes, it is this soul which can be sent to inhabit the form of some were-animal, while its owner remains at home, apparently unchanged, save that he usually appears languid and dreamy.

Among the many terrors which people the depths of the African 'bush,' with its strange translucent twilight, dark shadows, and quivering lights, witchcraft reigns supreme. Next to the granting of fertility, the chief function of beneficent Jujus is to afford at least some protection against this myriad-headed terror. As one of the principal Efik chiefs lately expressed it, 'Witchcraft is a very deep thing; among 'our people there is nothing else so deep, and the dread of it

* 'The Devils and Spirits of Babylonia,' R. C. Thompson.

'darkens multitudes of lives.' Against this terror there is no sure protection. One's nearest and dearest may be witch or wizard in disguise; while the bush-beasts which cross one's path may be the familiars of these dread beings, or even magicians themselves who have taken on were-form to one's hurt. In this world of magic the idea of shape-shifting seems not only natural but inevitable, and coincidences are always occurring to impress more deeply on the native mind the belief in were-beasts. To quote Mr. Upward:

'Primitive man was not conscious of any gap between himself and the animals about him, many of whom he reverenced or feared as his superiors in strength or cunning. It could not occur to him that they did not share with him in the possession of a soul or double; and the same privilege was extended to the trees of the wood, the plants of the field, and even to inorganic things, including the work of his own hands.' *

To the present writer, it seems that West African religions contain a greater element of spirituality than has usually been credited to them. Many customs, even those which at first sight seem most cruel and degraded, are found, on closer study, to hold the germ of some higher conception. In this respect, again, the West Africans may be compared with the ancient Egyptians, for, as Dr. Wallis Budge states:

'The putting to death of human beings at funerals does not appear to be the result of bloodthirstiness and cruelty on the part of those who sacrificed them; on the contrary, it arises from feelings of fear or respect . . . love and affection for the dead, and the wish to pay them honour.' †

Then, too, the study of African religions often reveals unexpectedly beautiful and gentle features. Love of children and reverence for the aged are almost universal. Among the Ekoi all quarrelling is forbidden in a house where there are little ones, on the plea that the latter love sweet words, kind looks, and gentle voices, and should these not be found in the family into which they have been reincarnated they will close their eyes and forsake the earth till a chance offers to return amid less quarrelsome surroundings. Almost everywhere, too, that 'Maxim of Ani' is obeyed as strictly to-day

* The Divine Mystery, p. 49.
† Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection, p. 225.

as when first enunciated upon the other side of the great continent : ' Sit not down when another is standing up if he ' be older than thou, even if thy rank in life be higher than his.'

Possibly the darker aspects of many beliefs can be attributed in great part to the shadow cast over the minds of the people by that dense tropical forest which covers such vast stretches of the West Coast. In open sun-lit lands, like the wide plains of Northern Nigeria and the Sudan, the more revolting customs seem to be dying out, as was the case in Egypt, with the cutting of the bush, and in Europe with the thinning of the great forests.

Considering the short distance which separates ourselves from a time when superstitions hardly less cruel than those of West Africa were rife among us, is it much to plead for patience and charity of judgment on behalf of peoples so different from ourselves ? For us, in the twentieth century, it is hard indeed to grasp the point of view of survivals such as these. Before their mental vision the path stretches broad and clear ; familiar as that which leads to their own farms or homesteads. To us it has been lost for centuries. Faint is now the trail and far the way, barred by the thorny tangles of alien thought, and overgrown with the weeds of forgetfulness.

P. Amaury Talbot.

GREEK MUSIC

1. **The Verse of Greek Comedy.** By J. W. White. Macmillan. 1912.
2. **The Harmonics of Aristoxenus.** Translated with notes by H. S. Macran. Oxford University Press. 1902.
3. **Greek Lyric Metre.** By W. Headlam. Journal of Hellenic Studies. 1902.
4. **Greek Melic Poets.** By H. W. Smyth. Macmillan. 1900.

TO the Greeks of the great age the word 'music' meant something very different from the idea it conveyed to the Alexandrians, the Romans, or ourselves; and their meaning of the word, if rightly apprehended, gives the key to the vital difference between the classical and the modern conception. Ἡ μουσική—music—was to the Athenians all literature. Moreover, literature was not so much written books as spoken words; the Muses were the daughters of memory, and education largely consisted of learning by heart the sound of great literature; the education of Ruskin in fact, who every day *said* his chapter of the Bible at his mother's knee.

So to the Athenians 'music' meant firstly the rhythm of musical speech, and then especially lyric poetry with some simple accompaniment of lyre or flute. But after Aristotle the meaning of the word began to alter, widening in some directions and narrowing in others, so that Aristides Quintilianus, a writer of the first century of our era, is able to subdivide 'music' into nine parts: three 'technical'—metric, rhythmic, and harmonic, or the studies of poetry, dancing, and composition, conducted on academic lines; three 'practical'—poetry, rhythmic invention, and melody, i.e. the actual practice of the three arts, as opposed to their theoretical study; and lastly three 'expository'—singing, acting, and instrumental music.

The last of these sections—instrumental music—had in the time of Aristides become the most important, as we see by the meaning of the Latin 'musica,' and its derivatives in modern languages. But in the great age this was far from

being the case. Music then was almost entirely vocal, and although its medium was sound, it was the sound of words, and not the sound of instruments.

The Greeks had very little instrumental music because they had very few musical instruments: and, as is the case with most of the things which the Greeks did not possess, they did not have them because they did not want them. They realised quite clearly that the most perfect of musical instruments is the human voice, and that it is the function of imperfect mechanical devices of wood and metal to play a secondary and supporting rôle, not to take the chief part in music. They agreed with the old Italian school of operatic composers, Bellini, Donizetti, Rossini—and Verdi, before he became infected with the Wagnerian heresy—to whom music was first and foremost 'bel canto.'

The only two kinds of instruments which the Greeks regarded as really musical were the lyre—*cithara, chelys, phorminx*—and the flute-clarionet, *aulos*. The art of playing the lyre was called citharistic, and the flute auletic; citharistic and auletic being thus together the equivalent of our phrase 'a little music *and* singing.'

They had certainly other implements for the production of sound: the trumpet, *salpinx*; the drum, *tympanum*; the Pan pipes, *syrinx*; the bell, *codon*; and the many varieties of harp, mostly with foreign names, the *trigon*, the *barbitos*, the *pandoura*, the *nablas*, the *sambuca*, the *magadis*, etc. But in Greek music the lyre and the flute alone are of importance, for they are the only Greek instruments fit for accompanying the voice, which is the true function of all instruments. Even a modern composer shrinks from bringing the voice into competition with drum or trumpet. Moreover the Greeks, unlike the English and the Romans, disliked *loud* noise, which they thought barbarous; and in their literature the bell, the trumpet, and the drum are generally spoken of with a certain scorn, as inartistic devices, fit only for the foreigners who invented them.

Of the lyre there were two forms, the *chelys* and the *cithara*. The *chelys* was a small instrument, made of wood and tortoise-shell, lightly put together, with seven strings, and not provided with any means of altering their pitch.

There is a specimen of the smaller type of *chelys* in the

British Museum. The wood is sycamore ; the two uprights are curved and fixed into the tortoise-shell, which forms the sound-board. The cross-bar slips over the points of the uprights and rests on notches. The length of the whole instrument is 22 inches ; the width varies between seven and nine inches. There are still marks on the cross-bar where the strings were wound and tightened, but the strings themselves have disappeared.

The *cithara* was more substantial, with a large sounding-board, its seven strings having stops which allowed the original note of each string to be raised a semitone by the pressure of the left forefinger. The *cithara* was the professional instrument employed in public performances ; the *chelys* was used at home and by amateurs.

The *cithara* originally, it appears, had only three strings. Linus, the mythological bard, increased them to four. Terpander, in the seventh century B.C., raised the number to seven, Pythagoras to eight. Phrynnis (fl. 445) added a ninth string ; Melanippides (fl. 420)—followed by Ion of Chios—a tenth. Finally Timotheus (446–357) completed the double octave by an eleventh string. The cross-bar could be turned—as is plainly seen on vase paintings—and projected on the right-hand side of the uprights, thus slackening or tightening all the strings. In some cases each separate string had its own clutch peg, working on the cross-bar, by which it could be tightened separately. Whether the fine shades of pitch and tone of which the Greek theorists were so fond of writing were actually realised in practice, it is impossible to determine.

But the *cithara* was an Apollinarian instrument, and art at Athens was Dionysiac—especially in the tragic theatre, where the only musical instrument allowed was the pipe of Dionysus, the *aulos*. The pipe required considerably more skill and practice in playing than the lyre, and the musical theorists in consequence almost confined their efforts to the stringed instrument. They contented themselves with the proverb '*auloedus est qui citharoedus fieri non potuit.*' Pipe playing was more of a trade. The female practitioners were of somewhat dubious character : the male artists were often reproached for their fat persons and their gluttony in eating and drinking.

As Hermes and Apollo between them invented the lyre, so Athena and Pan are connected with the pipe. The national goddess—as was proper—invented the national instrument in its simplest form, the syrinx. But, seeing the distortion of her cheeks caused by blowing, she threw away the pipe in disgust, and Pan took it for his own, to teach the Satyrs and the young Dionysus.

In the syrinx, the sound is produced by blowing across the open end of the tube or across an opening in the side of it. The *aulos* proper has a reed mouthpiece, and by blowing through this the air column is made to vibrate. These reeds were detachable, and soon wore out. They were usually of our clarinet type : a tube of cylindrical bore, with the acoustic properties of the ' stopped ' pipe, producing a fundamental tone an octave lower than the corresponding tone of an ' open ' pipe. The ancients probably knew of the other possible variety of reed : the oboe-type, with a tube of conical bore, having the acoustic properties of the ' open ' pipe, and giving the complete series of harmonics. But all the instruments that have at present been found are of cylindrical bore ; for example, the four pipes, now in the Naples Museum, found at Pompeii in 1867. They are straight tubes of ivory, and were originally covered with close-fitting bands of silver. Each tube has, at the end furthest from the finger-holes, a pear-shaped bulb of ivory, supporting a flaring tube of ivory, in which the mouthpiece was placed. They are not quite of the same length, and it is uncertain whether they were used singly or in pairs.

The double pipe was certainly more common than the single, if we accept the vase evidence ; and it was probably usual to play the melody on one pipe and an accompaniment in accord, with smaller intervals than the octave, on the second. The pipes were bored for the finger-holes : six for the open, eleven for the stopped pipe. In the early instruments, only four finger-holes were made, but when the diatonic scale was established the number of holes was increased, and various devices for closing them were used.

Near the mouthpiece there was a single hole—the syrinx—which, like the ' speaker ' in a modern clarinet, enabled the performer to produce without effort the harmonic tones of the instrument. In playing the double flute the exertion

of blowing was evidently considerable, and it was usual to wear a leather band—*phorbeia*—round the cheeks and over the mouth. Our authorities vary somewhat in their explanations: one says 'it was to prevent the player bursting 'his cheeks in blowing'; another that 'it was to soften the 'tone by preventing violent breathing.' Probably neither is correct, and the *phorbeia* merely served to hold the two pipes in position, leaving the hands free for stopping the notes.

In their simplest form the pipes were made of wood. There is a good specimen in the British Museum—a pair of sycamore-wood pipes found in a tomb near Eleusis. The longer pipe is 13½ inches, the shorter 12¼: each pipe has a ⅜ inch bore and six finger-holes. They could thus be played either singly or together. In the first case, the pipe would be held with one hand and the stopping managed by the fingers of the other hand. If both pipes were played together, all the fingers of both hands would be wanted, and the pipes were kept in position by the *phorbeia*. The Greeks in Italy invented a more elaborate form of pipe, with an interior tube of ivory and an outer cylinder of bronze. A pair of these pipes—with mouthpieces shaped in the form of a Maenad's bust—are also in the British Museum. Finally, in the same museum case there is a specimen of the rare '*plagiaulos*' discovered at Halicarnassus. It is made of bone and bronze, with a mouthpiece still entire, fixed, not to the end, but to the side of the pipe. Such instruments were apparently held in the same position and blown in the same way as our orchestral flute, but they were seldom used.

It will be noticed that neither the *cithara* nor the *aulos* was very elaborate in structure. They did not require any very long study for their mastery, and the professional musician, in our sense of the word, scarcely existed. The pipe was usually played by girls, who depended as much on their personal attractions as on their musical skill. In this, as in all things, the Greeks disliked the specialist, and when the specialist came to the front—specialist soldiers such as Philip of Macedonia, specialist teachers, specialist musicians—the true Greek ideas began at once to perish. A Greek prided himself above everything on versatility, and there is nothing more interesting in Aristotle than the elaborate pretence he makes of being merely

an amateur in every subject. Inspired by a gentleman's curiosity, and not by a pedant's love of research, he jots down his observations in careless notes for other careless but cultivated gentlemen to read.

Instrumental music, then, among the Greeks was comparatively simple ; musical theory was very much the reverse. There has always been a close connexion in England between the musical art and a certain eccentricity in the persons of its professors. In Greece the eccentrics mostly confined themselves to musical theory, where they revelled to their hearts' content: moral, mystical, medical, mathematical—Pythagoras, Plato, the Asclepiadae—every kind of theorist and every kind of delusion, intentional or involuntary. Pythagoras tried to force his mysticism and hazy mathematics into music : ' the intervals of music,' he said, ' are to be judged ' intellectually through numbers rather than sensibly by the ' ear.' In pursuance of this he constructed an instrument with only one string—a *monochord*, or, as it is sometimes called, a *canon*. The apparatus consisted of a single stretched string with a fixed stopping-point in the middle, called the *magas*, and a movable boss called the *hypagogeus* used to cut off from the string such fractions of its length as the theorist required. With this Pythagoras attempted to judge tones and fix scales by string measurements, adding a large amount of speculation as to ' sacred numbers ' and starting a series of mathematical calculations which were finally put in their proper place by Aristoxenus.

Plato combined this mysticism and mathematics with vague theories as to the ' music of the spheres ' and ' golden numbers,' and introduced a new diversion by confusing music and morals. In the third book of the ' Republic ' there is a great deal of talk about the morals of musical rhythm, while wind-music is tabooed altogether. The lyre is allowed—although grudgingly—on condition that musicians confine themselves strictly to serious tunes. The Asclepiadae took another and a bolder line. They claimed that music—under the blessing of God and with proper conditions of temple treatment and votive offerings—would cure all, or at least most, diseases. But this is the weaker side of Greek theorising.

There was also a vigorous and long-sustained effort, lasting

through several centuries, which finally settled the musical scale, and is still the foundation of musical technique. The earliest traditional scale was that of Hermes' lyre, with its three strings tuned e—a—e—. To these three very soon a fourth string was added, and a tetrachord formed e⌣ (semitone), f— (tone), —g— (″), —a—. The last note of the four—when later three more strings were added—was called *mesê*, 'middle,' and was considered the master note. The Greeks had no sense of a tonic sound, and while we read notes upwards they read downwards; moreover, no semitone between —a— and —g— was allowed, and so the tonic was impossible.

With the simple tetrachord given above the following laws were evolved:

(1) Between the two extremes of the four strings there shall be a consonance of sound called a *diatessaron*—the modern fourth.

(2) Between the string the highest in pitch and the string next to it lower in pitch, there shall be a separation of sounds not less than one full tone.

(3) Between the third string and the fourth string there shall be a separation in pitch equal to one semitone.

From two such simple tetrachords arranged together was built up the Sacred Enharmonic Conjunct Scale, the beginning of Western music, represented in our notation by the letters e—f—f sharp—a—b flat—b natural—d; where the upper and lower tetrachords have one note, the *mesê*—a—, in common. The last step was the introduction of the Diatonic Genus, probably borrowed from the East, which gave finally the Dorian Diatonic Conjunct Scale, e—f—g—a—b flat, c—d—.

So far the tetrachord could go. The next great innovation was made by Terpander, who added three more strings to the lyre, and practically invented the octave system. It is true that Terpander's lyre had only seven strings and was without any mechanism for semitone stopping; but, as Mr. J. Curtis has ingeniously suggested, this difficulty probably was got over by 'magadizing.' The upper octave of the lowest note was played as an harmonic on the lowest string. The pitch of the strings could not be altered during performance; but, as vase paintings show, the *chelys* admitted of semitone modification, if tuned beforehand, by means of thongs, plaited

on the tuning-bar and engaging the strings, which could then be tightened or relaxed at will.

These variations of pitch, and others effected by slackening or tightening all the strings with a turn of the tuning-bar, gave rise to the different scales known as ' harmonies,' Lydian, Aeolian, Mixo-lydian, etc. which developed during the seventh and the sixth centuries B.C. Pythagoras brought the process to an end by adding an eighth string to the lyre, and thereby did away with the necessity of re-tuning and passing from one scale to another.

The Pythagorean lyre was the seven-stringed *cithara* tuned to the lower —d—, with an eighth string added, and the Phrygian trope d—e—f—g—a—b—c—d— was created. Pythagoras was an innovator and a successful one. Although the old-fashioned musicians clung to the old harmonies, produced by re-tuning, the idea of playing the various scales by extending the compass of the lyre prevailed, and the ' theatrical ' tropes,' as they were called, were gradually extended by the addition of fresh strings.

The Pythagorean scale of eight notes consists of two tetrachords, or groups of four notes, with a major tone. The lower tetrachord consists of the notes from Hupatê to Mesê ; the higher from Paramesê to Netê ; the interval between Mesê and Paramesê is the ' disjunctive tone ' ' *Tonos Diazeuktikos.*'

Ion of Chios, adding a tenth string, made what is called the Lesser Perfect system of three tetrachords and a major tone, which in our notation would be represented thus : —a— (taken into the scale to complete the octave and called Proslambanomenos) ; b—c—d—e—, the third tetrachord ; e—f—g—a Mesê, the first tetrachord ; a Mesê, b flat —c—d—the second tetrachord.

This is the scheme to which Thomas Peacock refers in ' Gryll Grange,' when the old gentleman, introducing his family, says : ' Their names are Betsey, Catherine, Dorothy, Eleanor, ' Fanny, Grace, Anna ; the key of A minor. They were ' christened from the Greek diatonic scale and make up two ' conjunct tetrachords, and this young gentleman, whose name ' is Algernon, is the Proslambanomenos.'

In all these Greek scales, the key-note lies not at the beginning, but within the scale—Mesê, middle—and is not always in the same position. Pythagoras, in his fine vague

way, compared it to the sun in the centre of the universe, whose course through the heaven is ever changing and yet ever the same.

The final stage in scale-making was reached by Aristoxenus —and the Disjunct or Greater System Complete was established thus:—a—b—c—d—e—e—f—g—a—b—c—d—e—e—f—g—a. Didymus (fl. A.D. 60) and Claudius Ptolemy (fl. A.D. 130) completed the mechanical structure of musical theory.

Aristoxenus *the* Musician was born at Tarentum in the first half of the fourth century B.C. His youth was spent in Mantinea, and after studying for a time under the Pythagorean, Xenophilus of Chalcis, he became a pupil of Aristotle. He is described as being very austere and dignified in behaviour, with a pronounced antipathy to laughter. But he was a disagreeable man, a backbiter and slanderer. When Theophrastus was chosen to succeed Aristotle as head of the Peripatetic school, a position which Aristoxenus had expected for himself, the musician took his revenge by propagating unseemly stories—for he was also a writer of biographies and general essayist—concerning his own teacher Aristotle, Aristotle's teacher Plato, Plato's teacher Socrates, and even Socrates' wife. His personal character, however, does not affect the merits of his scientific work, and the three books of his Harmonics—which are excellently translated by Dr. Macran—are by far the best guide to Greek musical theory.

The 'Harmonics,' a book of about seventy pages, begins in the true Aristotelian manner with a definition of the subject.

'The branch of study which bears the name Harmonic is to be regarded as one of the several divisions, or special sciences, embraced by the general science that concerns itself with melody. Among these special sciences, Harmonic occupies a primary and fundamental position. Its subject matter consists of the fundamental principles—all that relates to the theory of scales and keys . . . . In advancing to the profounder speculations which confront us, when scales and keys are enlisted in the service of poetry, we pass from the study under consideration to the all-embracing science of Music.'

The first step, he argues, to a scientific investigation of music is to adjust our different notions of change of voice, i.e. change in position of voice. This will lead us on to musical intervals, to melody and to scales. Then will come notes,

and finally, as every scale is located in a certain 'region of 'the voice,' we must treat of these regions in general and detail. A discussion of voice precedes an account of the chromatic scale, and Book I ends with an investigation of continuous melody.

The Second Book begins with a personal experience. Plato's pupils, says Aristoxenus, used to come to his lectures on 'The Good,' expecting to get some practical advice on Riches, Health, or Strength. When they found that his real subject was 'The Good' as a predicate to 'The Finite,' or perhaps some sort of Geometry or Astronomy, they were proportionately disgusted. It is therefore necessary to realise what Harmonic is: it is not a sublime science and it has no moral value; but on the other hand it is a necessary part of a musician's equipment, and appeals in the last resort to the two faculties of hearing and intellect. A recapitulation of the seven divisions of the science follows. The method pursued is admirable, and many a shrewd blow is dealt both to the Pythagorean theorists and the professional musician. Of the first Aristoxenus says: 'To make the amateur a judge 'in science is the mark of ignorance, profound and invincible'; of the second, 'No instrument will supply a foundation for 'the principles of harmony: harmony is permanent and 'immutable, and it is sheer folly to find it in the finger-holes 'of the aulos or the strings of the cithara.' The third book is shorter and less interesting. It consists of twenty-six musical problems and axioms, stated in the manner of Euclid: e.g. 'It is required to prove that from the highest note of a 'Pycnum there is but one progression in either direction'; and so the 'Harmonics' ends.

This brief summary gives a very inadequate idea of the enormous importance of Aristoxenus in musical history. His method—a combination of scientific experiment and common sense—revolutionised the treatment of theory; and his method, as so often happens with the Greeks, is more important than the actual facts he gives us.

But the later developments of musical theory form part of the history of Hellenistic rather than Hellenic music. It must never be forgotten that to the Greeks of the great age, and especially to the Athenians, the highest form of music was vocal music. Syllables rather than notes were the material

with which their composers worked. We possess indeed much more Greek music than is commonly supposed—not the music of the Delphic Hymn to Apollo or the Euripidean fragment from the 'Orestes,' but the texts of the melic poets and the tragedians. Their musical significance is obscured merely by our pernicious habit of reading instead of reciting verse; of relying on the eyes rather than on the ear. We must think of musical words and phrases instead of musical notes and bars, if we want to get back to the Greek point of view, and the varying length of syllables will correspond to the varying length of notes. Dr. White's statement that 'in Greek poetry all short syllables are normally of the same 'length; all long syllables are normally of the same length 'and the time ratio of the former to the latter is 1 to 2,' does not agree with facts.

Aristoxenus gives us a list of varieties in length of syllables, which is a source of much difficulty to those who cling to the simple and convenient belief of nothing but long and short. The shortest syllable of all, he says, is the 'Chronos Prôtos,' 'the first time'; then comes the 'Chronos Disêmos,' 'the 'diseme syllable,' apparently twice the length of the first time. Then we have the triseme, the tetraseme, the pentaseme and the hexaseme syllable, three, four, five, and six times respectively the length of the first.

It is quite possible to construct a table of quantities in Greek words, which will match our table of notes, from breve to semi-demi-semi-quaver. The shortest possible note in our music is the simple short vowel, as it comes three times in ἔλεγε. Long runs of such short-syllable notes are a distinct feature of Greek musical composition, scarcely possible in any other language, and are especially frequent in Euripides. The demi-semi-quaver is the short vowel in doubtful position, e.g. the first syllable in ἄμνος. The semi-quaver is the half-elided diphthong which appears in ποιῶ; the quaver the short vowel before a double consonant, as ἔξω. The crotchet is a long vowel in the simplest position, ἦδε. The minim is heard in ᾄδει, the semibreve in ὦνδρες, and the breve in εὐστοχεῖ.

The many varieties of Greek melic poetry again are an equivalent to the different forms of modern musical composition. The four chief divisions Dithyramb and Nome, Hymn and Epinician Ode, correspond roughly to our Overture

and Concerto, Sonata and Symphony. The dithyramb was the most dramatic of all the forms, and in its early history can scarcely be distinguished from tragedy. Both were closely connected with Dionysus, reached perfection at Athens during the fifth century B.C., and then decayed. Originally the difference between them was merely one of rhythm. The dithyramb, with its cyclic chorus, was a round dance, a *rondo* in double-three time, as its name shows. Tragedy, with its tragic chorus, was a square dance, a 'contre-danse,' in four-time, the movements of the dancers being transverse, across the orchestra.

Arion of Lesbos introduced the dithyrambic form; Lasos of Hermione elaborated its final shape. Melanippides and Cinesias were the chief composers in the great period. The dithyramb became more lyric, more imaginative than tragedy, and its history may be summed up in Plutarch's words: 'At 'first the art of poetry took the chief place, and the flute was 'only a subordinate helper; but afterwards it was corrupted.' The music of the words became less, and the music of the accompaniment more important. As we see by inscriptions, after B.C. 300 the flute-player was esteemed above the poet; and soon the dithyramb as a musical form was dead.

The *nome* partook of the nature of a symphony and a concerto. It resembled the latter, in that either of the chief orchestral instruments could be used, while the solo portions of the melody were of very considerable importance. The word *nome* means both 'ranger' and 'arranger,' and the *nome* was like a symphony in its wide range of subjects and the strict arrangement of its subject matter. It consisted of five main parts — Archa, Katatropa, Omphalos, Sphragis, Epilogos—andante, allegro, adagio, scherzo, finale, a modern composer would call them. The Archa—Beginning—stated the themes; the Katatropa—Transition, generally in quick time—led to the main subject, the Omphalos or Navel of the work, which was very often a poetical treatment of the struggle between Apollo and the Dragon, the powers of Light and Darkness. This was followed by the Sphragis, the Seal, where the poet introduced his own personal feelings, often expressed in proverbial language and perhaps sung in a higher pitch than the rest. The Epilogos or Finale brought the work to an end.

In the hands of its greatest composers, Timotheus of Miletus and Philoxenus of Cythera, the *nome* became a serious rival to tragedy. Indeed Timotheus in his 'Persae,' and Philoxenus in his 'Cyclops,' invited comparison with Aeschylus and Euripides. Timotheus, like some modern composers, tried to make music express both the most intimate emotions of men and the greatest forces of nature. Like many another, he wrote a passage of 'storm music'; the comment of his audience was that the sound was like nothing so much as a pot boiling over. In the 'Semele' he tried to express the agony of a mother's travail: the critics said, 'Yes, your words certainly have a 'shrieking sound; but have they anything else?'

The only difference between the methods of Strauss in the 'Domestic Symphony' and those of Timotheus is that one works with notes, the other with words. It was the sound of the words that caught the ear of a Greek audience; e.g. the opening phrase of Timotheus' 'Artemis'—*μαινάδα θυιάδα φοιβάδα λυσσάδα*—with its accumulation of strange epithets, the dactyl four times repeated, and the alliterative ending.

The dithyramb and the nome were the most, the hymn the least, dramatic of the varieties of melic poetry. The original meaning of the word Hymn is simply 'a joining 'together of sounds,' a symphony or sonata, and it was always used in a wide sense to cover many forms of musical composition. It was generally reflective or narrative, accompanied by the lyre, and could take the form of either a choral or a solo. Its history is coincident with melic poetry, and ranges from the Homeric Hymns on to the age of Alcaeus and Sappho and as late as Timotheus.

The Epinikion or Triumphal Ode is like our symphony in the elaboration of its musical form, and in the fact that it was brought to perfection by one man. The Theban eagle and the singer of Bonn wrote in other forms than the ode and the symphony, but these particular forms they made their own, and it is recognised that in them they will never be surpassed. The Epinikion in its simplest shape is just the musical phrase

τήνελλα καλλίνικε
χαῖρ' ἄναξ.

'See, the conquering hero comes.'

As the Choral Symphony is built up from a few simple tunes,

so Pindar builds up from this the wonderful structure of the Fourth Pythian Ode, where the splendour of epic poetry is wedded to the most elaborate verbal music. Not only are the formal rules of *nome* composition observed, but a subtle system of word assonance and repetition is used. Other composers, Bacchylides and Simonides, attempted the Epinikion with success, but Pindar stands supreme.

The *Dithyramb*, *Nome*, *Hymn* and *Ode* are the four chief musical forms, but there is a large number of less important varieties. The Prosodion and the Paean, for example, are processional music: the Prosodion, grave and serious in the Handelian style; the Paean now martial, like some of Chopin's Polonaises, now festive, like our drinking song or musical grace. The Skolion was also of this last style, but of a more irregular nature: as its name shows, it was syncopated, ragtime music. Another variety of the processional was the Hymenaeus and the Epithalamion, both sung at the wedding ceremony and having the refrain as their distinctive feature. These were bright, cheerful rhythms; the Threnos and the Kommos were of a mournful type, the music of lamentation, written in a minor key; a funeral march or a penitential psalm. The Hyporchema and the Enkomion, on the other hand, were the music of mirthful revelry, corresponding to our ballet music or Christmas carol. Finally the Sillos—in one of its forms at least—was a scherzo; the Adonidion a mournful largo; while the Erotika answer fairly well to our waltz rhythms and ballad music.

But the Greek melic poets—Alcman, Sappho, Terpander, and many another—only exist for us in inconsiderable fragments, and we have to turn elsewhere for musical material. Abundance of such material we possess—if we know how to use it—in the works of the five great musicians whose librettos are still carefully being studied word for word, often with very little thought of their musical significance. Their names are Pindar, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Euripides, and Aristophanes, and the distinctive features of their musical style will best be illustrated by comparing them with some of our instrumental composers; for example the great classical quartette Bach, Beethoven, Mendelssohn, Mozart, and the modern Richard Strauss.

Pindar and Bach have many points of union. They are

both the fathers of a style: somewhat austere, somewhat dry, somewhat lacking in variety; but never trivial, never mean, never uninteresting. Neither is easy reading, nor are the beauties of either revealed to the casual student. They are impersonal artists with a passion for perfection in form, and seldom obtrude their own emotions. The Well-tempered Clavichord and the Epinician Odes are the delight of the accomplished musician, Greek or English, and Pindar's formal system of Strophe and Anti-strophe has its analogy in the Preludes and Fugues of the German master. Pindar and Bach are the founders of an art: they are perfect in their self-imposed limitations, but they left a wide field for their successors.

Aeschylus and Beethoven, the greatest names in music, carried on their work to the loftiest heights that the human mind has reached. Both men were cast in the heroic mould and were born in an heroic age; one a contemporary of the Persian Wars and knowing by actual experience the joy and thrill of mortal danger; the other inspired by the greatest event of modern history, the French Revolution, and an eye-witness of the trampling up and down Europe of his first hero, the man of the people, Napoleon Buonaparte. With Pheidias and Michael Angelo they are the supreme examples of the grand style in art, and in many of their works—the choruses of the 'Agamemnon,' the Fifth Symphony, the Waldstein Sonata—music seems to have fulfilled Aristotle's definition and reached the extreme limits which the stuff of which she is made allows.

The next pair, Sophocles and Mendelssohn, although of the highest rank as artists, cannot be compared with their great predecessors as men. Both were of a placid, even temperament, successful and enjoying the good things of life, and little troubled by the Titan Spirit of revolt. They were out-of-door men, and the best part of their music—the Hebrides overture and the choruses in the 'Oedipus Coloneus'—is directly inspired by the outward and visible aspect of nature. Though they give perfect artistic form to their thoughts, their imagination is not of the most original kind. Τὰ κοῖνα καινῶς, 'things common to all in a new shape,' may serve as a motto for both. On the other hand they are unsurpassed as masters of their material: the graceful diction of Sophocles, the

clear-cut orchestration of Mendelssohn, are the perfection of workmanship; what they lack is a touch of feminine perversity and malice.

Of this feminine spirit Euripides and Mozart, the creators of Phaedra and Zerlina, have their full share. They are the most fascinating of all the great company: men whose lives were full of trouble, and whose works are full of exhilaration and grace. All the charm of melody is theirs: in Euripides joined to an irony which disdained fools, in Mozart to an invincible cheerfulness which overrode grief. They are as various as life itself, and can employ every kind of style. Humour, romance, melodrama, mysticism: all come alike to the composers of the 'Alcestis' and 'Figaro,' 'Orestes' and 'Don Giovanni,' the 'Bacchae' and 'The Magic Flute.' Both have been grossly mishandled by critics. Sometimes it is on technical grounds; because Euripides employed Cephisophon to instruct the flute-player instead of doing it himself—as though the instrumental music had any real importance at Athens; or because Mozart never succeeded in finding an adequate and original libretto—as though the words had any great value to a man whose native tongue was German. Others adopt the tone of artistic morality—'Euripides vulgarised 'tragedy'; as a matter of fact he founded the modern realistic drama. 'It is a pity that Mozart did not confine himself to 'sacred and instrumental music'; the revival of opera as an artistic form is with these critics a work of no importance.

Certainly both men offer a handle to criticism, for they were not in complete harmony with the form in which they worked. Like Thucydides, they often had to struggle with their material and did not always produce their effect. The delicate humour of the 'Alcestis' and 'Così fan tutte' tends to disappear under the conditions of stage performance. The 'Helena' and 'The Magic Flute' are often judged to be failures because of our lack of wit to understand them.

The last pair, Aristophanes and Richard Strauss, are an example of the rarest of all combinations: poetical imagination and unbridled humour, the dramatic sense and the musician's gift of song. Aristophanes is easily the cleverest man of his day, Strauss is perhaps the greatest intellect that we have

now amongst us. Both are constantly tempted from their true sphere of music by their intellectual interests, and both developed under much the same influences. There is the destructive philosophy of Socrates and Nietzsche as we see it in 'The Clouds' and 'Zarathustra.' There is the grossness of a materialistic age which appears in all of Aristophanes' works, and in Strauss finds its most obvious expression in 'Feuersnoth.' Finally there is the saving idealism of Euripides and Mozart. Aristophanes is closely akin to Euripides in musical style and dramatic manner, for such plays as the 'Lysistrata' and 'The Birds' are quite as serious as the 'Helena' and the 'Alcestis.' In politics, however, Aristophanes posed as a reactionary, and therefore he pretended to admire Aeschylus, 'the man of Marathon,' and to dislike Euripides, the prophet of the new socialism. But literature and music are independent of politics. Aristophanes, like many Athenians, knew his Euripides by heart, and the comedies are full of reminiscences of the tragedian's music: so full, indeed, that it is often difficult to distinguish between parody and original.

It is the same with Strauss. No more than any other musician could he escape from the dead hand of the Wagnerian music drama. Wagner—a lesser Beethoven endowed with the dramatic gift—is responsible for 'Ein Heldenleben,' 'Salome,' 'Electra.' But these are not the real Strauss, who traces rather back to Mozart. 'The Rose Cavalier' is 'Figaro' in a modern dress. Both Aristophanes and Strauss are enormously inventive, and both perhaps are somewhat lacking in a sense of proportion. The puritan in morals is offended by their grossness; the puritan in music by their realism. But they are great enough to carry off their weaknesses easily, and it must be remembered that humorous music, like humorous poetry and humorous painting, is almost a contradiction in terms. Hardly any but these two have escaped the pitfall of the trivial: Aristophanes by his subtle use of parody, Strauss by his ingenious perversion of musical forms.

But though the Greeks have analogies among the moderns, their musical methods were essentially different from ours. It is a difficult matter to put clearly, with our system of stress

accent and variable quantity of syllables, but a simple example will at least illustrate their method:

'Hi tiddly hi ti hi!'

the mere words, by their sound without music, suggest an idea of irresponsible revelry. Now in Greek there are a large number of such combinations of syllables, which express each a different idea. Our distinction between vocal and instrumental music did not exist. The words are the music. Singing and speaking were not very widely separated: every Greek word is a musical phrase, and every sentence a more or less definite melody.

The difference between the dialogue and the chorus in a Greek play is that in the former simple melody predominates; in the latter there is musical form—counterpoint. The chief rhythms connoted different ideas. The trochaic, from its association with proverbs, was didactic in character, and thus suitable to gnomic wisdom. Moreover, as the original tendency of Greek speech, like Latin and English, was trochaic, if in a lyric passage the language of ordinary life is wanted, trochaics are used. There is a striking example in the 'Alcestis.' The chorus, in dactylic rhythm, has described with elegiac pathos the surroundings of Alcestis' tomb: then in the description comes a traveller who stands by the tomb and speaks, the metre suddenly changing into the trochees of ordinary talk:

αὕτα ποτὲ προὔθαν' ἀνδρός,
νῦν δ' ἐστὶ μάκαιρα δαίμων.
χαῖρ', ὦ πότνι', εὖ δὲ δοίης.
'Ave Maria, give us thy blessing.'

In the same way Schumann, in 'The Two Grenadiers,' having established the iambic rhythm for the song, gets his effect at the end by letting the dactylic rhythm of the 'Marseillaise' strike across the main tune.

The glyconic rhythm *ὑμὴν ὦ ὑμέναι' ὑμήν*—the refrain of the marriage song—had for the Greek mind all the associations, and more, that the tune of Mendelssohn's Wedding March has for us, and was much more susceptible of adaptation. When glyconics are introduced in a chorus, ideas of marriage may be expected, and those things that go, or should go, with marriage,—love, affection, comfort, a quiverful of children,

etc. There is a beautiful example of glyconic music in 'The Trojan Women' of Euripides—delicately poised on the edge of parody—where Cassandra, the unwedded bride of Apollo, sings her own tragic wedding song.

The Ionic a minore, or, as it is sometimes called, the Anacreontic, lă lă lā—lă lā—lă lā lā, is of the same nature as the English convivial phrase quoted before and suggests unbridled merry-making and joy; it has the same effect as the insistent *motiv* of the peasants' merry-making in the Pastoral Symphony.

In strong contrast to the glyconic and Anacreontic are the various Dorian rhythms, such as the enhoplion, and the epitrite. Dactylo-spondaic in character, they are like our Handelian square measures, expressive of manly virtue and independence; such emotions as are evoked in an Englishman's mind by 'Rule, Britannia,' and 'God Save the King,' or by such poems as Wordsworth's 'Ode to Duty'—'Stern daughter of the voice 'of God.'

These various rhythms are equivalent to what is called in modern music a *figure*; 'any short succession of notes, 'either in melody or a group of chords, which produces a single 'complete and distinct impression.' When they carried with them, as they usually did, some definite association of ideas, they were used as a modern composer uses a 'Leitmotiv' or 'guiding theme'; which, to quote Parry again, 'consists 'of figures or short passages of melody of marked character, 'which illustrate, or as it were label, certain personages 'or situations in the drama of which the music is the counterpart.'

It was in the management of these varying rhythms that a Greek master could show his musical skill, using all sorts of devices, corresponding to our counterpoint, so as to shift from rhythm to rhythm while keeping the movement of the whole passage going. Some of the more simple of such devices were these:

(1) A link syllable interposed between two lines and so designed that it can go with either.

(2) Echo, the end of one line repeated at the beginning of the next.

(3) Overlapping, where the middle part of a line is common to two rhythms.

As Dr. Headlam shows, in the brilliant essay from which these details are taken, a good example of all three is to be found in the great chorus of the 'Agamemnon,' ll. 681–689, where the first five lines, with their proverbial wisdom, are in trochaics. At line six there is a *link* of one long syllable and the rhythm shifts for two lines to Ionic a minore, to describe the wanton Helen flying to the East. Then, in line eight, there is a transition to glyconics by overlapping—a change which becomes vital when we turn to the corresponding line in the antistrophe, where the marriage of Helen and Paris is described.

This then, briefly, is the method whereby every tragic chorus and every Pindaric ode was written: subtle, elaborate, and elusive as the curving lines of the Parthenon. But, besides this, every Greek word and every Greek phrase was music. We cannot too strongly emphasise the truth that to a Greek and to a Roman poet it was the sound of the words that mattered.

αἰαῖ ταὶ μαλάχαι μὲν, ἐπὰν κατὰ κᾶπον ὄλωνται,

as Moschus sings, or

'Eheu fugaces, Postume, Postume.'

The poet was a musician first and a logician afterwards. How far sound will override sense will depend on different temperaments. Pindar, for example, is chiefly concerned with musical form. Euripides has a good many other things to consider besides the sound of his verse; but in every case, the sound is the first consideration.

F. A. Wright.

CASANOVA

1. **Lettres de Femmes à Jacques Casanova.** Recueillies et Annotées par ALDO RAVÀ. Traduites de l'Italien par EDOUARD MAYNIAL. Paris: Société des Éditions Louis Michaud. 1913.
2. **Jacques Casanova, Vénitien.** Une vie d'aventurier au XVIIIe Siècle. Par CHARLES SAMARAN. Paris: Calmann-Lévy. 1914.

THE opinion of the literary world has seldom fluctuated more widely in regard to any autobiographical work than in its estimation of the Memoirs of Casanova. Placed by common consent in the Index Expurgatorius for almost two generations, often declared to be spurious and its author set down as a myth, the volumes received little attention except from those who read them for the sake of their ribaldry. In the course of time an inevitable reaction rescued the book from obloquy and gave it a position among the most famous of its class. It was acclaimed as an incomparable 'human 'document,' and while few doubted that it was a work of genius many would have been willing to rank it among the greatest of autobiographies. Latterly, though critics are less generous of praise, the Memoirs of Casanova have had a larger circle of scholarly readers than at any period since their publication. In almost every country in Europe distinguished antiquaries are engaged in annotating the voluminous pages, endeavouring to verify each statement and identify all the personages described. It is a colossal labour, for Casanova (though gifted with a remarkable memory) wrote his autobiography mainly from recollection when an old man, and consequently made many mistakes; while numbers of the characters described in his narrative are obscure individuals, or their names are disguised under a pseudonym. In this respect his memoirs may be regarded as one of the great cryptograms of literature.

The task of 'documenting' the eight large volumes, which is all the more attractive to the scholar by reason of its difficulties, has much historical importance. For nowhere else is it

possible to find such a comprehensive picture of social life in all its phases upon the continent of Europe in the middle part of the Eighteenth Century. It is the history of a nomad existence during more than thirty years by one whose blood was that of the *cabotin*, and to whom excitement and adventure were as essential as his daily bread. The pages are as crowded with marvellous incident as the tale of Gil Blas or Don Quixote. Almost every town of importance is the scene of some wonderful exploit or shameless indiscretion. From Constantinople to London, from St. Petersburg to Madrid, the restless Venetian pursued his tempestuous journeys unceasingly, never making a permanent abode in any land. With truth he might have boasted that there was no country in Europe that was not full of his labours. The *dramatis personae*, too, are as interesting as the story, for Casanova describes with equal fidelity the most illustrious as well as the most ignoble of his acquaintances. Hovering between the *salon* and the tavern, passing from the palace to the *bordel*, he gives an account of everyone who seemed to him worthy of notice. Thus his pages are filled with the strangest medley, an interview with a great king succeeding an encounter with an obscure sharper, the portrait of some noble lady appearing almost side by side with that of a notorious courtesan ; and a vast crowd of thieves and clowns, lackeys and chambermaids, is mixed among the most respectable of the *bourgeoisie*. One meets also many a famous writer and illustrious statesman. The Memoirs of Casanova are indeed a vast map of humanity, and a fully documented edition, when the labours of the scholar have made its production possible, will add appreciably to our general knowledge of the period.

In spite, however, of the variety of the material and the vigour of the narrative, the work does not reach the highest excellence. Though unquestionably a man of genius, Casanova shows no evidence of genius in telling the story of his life. Since he did not possess the gift of portraiture, with which Boswell was endowed in so full a measure, his characters for the most part are lay figures scarcely recognisable from one another except by the antics they play. With the exception of one or two, each of the fair women who won his affections, and upon whom he lavishes all the eloquence of his pen, seems alike in disposition and character, and it is seldom possible

to realise what manner of person she was in real life. In no case does he ever succeed in drawing a masterly portrait. Similarly, he fails entirely to convey an impression of the places that he depicts. Local colour is always lacking, though a wealth of detail is usually provided. In all but name St. Petersburg seems the same as Paris : there is little apparent difference between London and Madrid. As in the Elizabethan theatre, each scene is merely indicated by a label.

Giacomo Casanova, the son of strolling players, was born at Venice in 1725. When sixteen years old he took his degree as Doctor of Law at the University of Padua, a classical scholar of some proficiency already, and though his temperament was wholly unsuited to such a calling he decided to become a priest. After flying in dismay from the dreariness of a country parish at Martirana in Calabria, he obtained an appointment at Rome as one of the secretaries of Cardinal Acquaviva, but an act of folly soon led to his dismissal. While still only eighteen, he drifted to Constantinople in search of adventure, having first procured a commission as ensign in the Venetian army. Already he had met with much luck at the gaming tables, and his *aplomb* and the elegance of his manners had gained him admission to the best society. Tall and virile, with bold Mephistophelian features and the gayest of hearts, there were few who could resist his blandishments when it suited him to please. From his earliest youth he had always sought good company, both his education and his disposition unsuiting him for the station in which he was born. Encouraged by success he returned to his native city, expecting to be received as a man of fashion, hoping to live a life of ease as a professional gamester. Fortune, however, did not continue to smile upon him. A week after his arrival in Venice he had lost all that he had won, and for many months was compelled to earn his living as a fiddler in the theatre.

At last, by a lucky chance he was rescued from this uncongenial situation. One night he happened to be a passenger in a gondola with a wealthy senator, named Bragadin, who during the journey was seized by an attack of apoplexy. Carrying the sick man to his home, Casanova refused to leave the house till he had recovered. ' If I went away the patient would die,' he asserted, with an air of mystery, ' and he will live as long as ' I am near him.' It was a most crafty pretence, as Casanova,

no doubt, knew well enough, for Bragadin and his intimates were slaves to superstition, devoted to the occult sciences, ever on the watch for the supernatural. Upon his recovery the senator seemed convinced that his new acquaintance had saved his life, and when the young rascal informed him that 'an old hermit, who lived on the Carpegna mountain,' had taught him 'a certain numeral calculus which gave answers to 'any questions,' the nobleman declared peremptorily that it was 'Solomon's key, vulgarly called cabalistic science.' A test was made without delay. Signor Bragadin and his friends propounded various questions, to which Casanova, through his 'oracle,' invented ingenious answers. The senator professed to be delighted, and, having neither wife nor children, determined to adopt the young man. 'If you will be my son 'you have only to acknowledge me as your father,' he told him, 'and for the future, until my death, I will treat you as my 'own child.' But although Casanova would have his readers believe that the credulous Bragadin was an innocent dupe, it is not improbable that the old statesman found it convenient to obtain the services of such an incomparable trickster, who in that age of chicanery could be employed successfully in political intrigue. Be that as it may, the senator remained the friend and protector of Casanova for the next eighteen years, behaving to him as the most indulgent of fathers.

With plenty of money in his pockets, young, handsome and robust, the erstwhile fiddler soon became a conspicuous figure in the gay city of Venice. He squandered large sums at the faro tables; he made love to every pretty woman he set eyes on. Intoxicated by prosperity, he was always falling into scrapes. His friends were far less numerous than his enemies. At last, after the volatile youth had made several appearances before the magistrates, his protector advised him to quit his native city for a time, fearing with much reason that his conduct would attract the attention of the Inquisition. Thus, at the end of three years Casanova set out once more upon his wanderings.

At the very onset of his travels he experienced one of the great passions of his life, falling in love with a beautiful French girl, named Henriette, who had fled from home, disguised in male attire, because her step-father wished to place her in a convent. Yet, though he was deeply infatuated, the amour,

as usual, was of brief duration, for the adventurer always shrank from the prospect of marriage, knowing that the fickleness of his disposition would make domestic happiness impossible. With cold cynicism he regarded infidelity as one of the necessary attributes of mankind :

'When I hear women talking about the bad faith and inconstancy of men, and maintaining that when men make promises of eternal constancy they are always deceivers, I confess they are right, and I join in their complaints. Still, it cannot be helped, for the promises of lovers are dictated by the heart, and consequently the lamentations of women only make me want to laugh. Alas ! we love without heeding, and cease to love in the same manner.'

Now that he was free to make a home where he chose, Casanova turned his footsteps towards Paris, the city which, next to his own beloved Venice, had always most attraction for him. During this—his first—visit most of his associates were theatrical people, and he began to occupy himself in writing for the stage, some of his comedies and librettos achieving a considerable success. Under the tutorship of Crébillon he soon acquired a scholarly knowledge of the French tongue, while his wit and audacity secured him the favourable regard of Madame de Pompadour. For the sake of prestige he called himself the Chevalier de Seingalt. During the space of two years he remained in Paris, happy and caressed, till some foolish scrape obliged him to depart in haste. After a brief sojourn in Vienna he returned to his native city.

Finding his patron as indulgent as before, he plunged once again into the old life of riot and debauchery. More than ever a slave to play, he was a constant visitor at all the gaming-houses, losing large sums at the faro tables. He betrayed the daughter of a wealthy broker who was connected with a patrician family ; he sought and obtained clandestine interviews with a beautiful nun in the island of Murano. A hundred disgraceful tricks soon made him a marked man. At last, in the year 1755, his conduct—as sooner or later was inevitable—attracted the notice of the Inquisitors. Arrested, according to his own account, on the charge of dabbling in alchemy, he was condemned to five years' imprisonment 'under the Leads'—the terrible dungeons in the roof of the Palace of the Doges.

For many months he endured the agonies of solitary confinement in a dismal cell, tortured by vermin, terrified by rats.

The winter was one of excessive severity ; the summer brought abnormal heat. Blessed with a marvellous physique, he suffered little in health, keeping a brave heart all the time, always bent upon escape. With the aid of an iron spike, so he tells us, he managed after weeks of labour to break a large hole in the floor of his prison, but when his task was nearly complete he was detected by his gaoler. Fearing punishment for his negligence, the man did not report the matter to the authorities, contenting himself with transferring the prisoner to another cell and professing to watch him more closely. Yet his cunning was no match for that of Casanova, or perhaps, as is more probable, he was bribed by the devoted Bragadin to shut his eyes. Having found means to communicate with a monk confined in the dungeon above, the wily Casanova sent him the spike concealed in a large bible, and with this the monk was able to make a breach in the floor large enough for his confederate to ascend into the upper apartment. The rest of the adventure resembles Jack Sheppard's famous escape from Newgate. Boring a hole in the ceiling of the monk's cell, the two prisoners gained the roof, whence, after a hazardous climb over the leads, they entered another wing of the palace by a garret window, and bursting through the doors that barred their way they succeeded eventually in reaching the street. Jumping into a gondola, Casanova made for Fusina, on the mainland, and was soon beyond the jurisdiction of the Republic. Regarding himself now as an exile for life, he set out with all speed for Paris, intending to ' put his talents to account.'

In the French capital he had earned already some reputation as a wit and a writer, and taking advantage of his friendship with the Abbé de Bernis, Secretary for Foreign Affairs, it was not long before he had persuaded the ministers to appoint him one of the managers of the State lottery. In a little while, too, he was despatched on a financial mission to Holland. Wherever he went he was asked to tell the story of his flight from ' The Leads,' this great prison-breaking exploit having made him a popular hero. At the house of the Marquise d'Urfé—a foolish old woman with a passion for astrology, who believed him to be ' an adept of the first order ' in the occult sciences—he met the best society in Paris, and during a large portion of her life the superstitious lady continued to have implicit faith in his supernatural powers. She placed

her immense fortune at his disposal, and was always willing to obey his most audacious commands. Since the senator Bragadin continued to make him a generous allowance, he lived in the greatest luxury.

For eighteen years he remained an exile, wandering over the Continent. Sooner or later some disgraceful escapade compelled him to make a hurried departure from each town that he visited. Intrigue of every kind had an irresistible fascination for him. 'If one tells a lie a sufficient number 'of times,' he declares in his memoirs, 'one ends in believing 'it.' His luck and dexterity as a gambler enabled him to win large sums of money; his pretended skill as an astrologer made every credulous acquaintance an easy dupe. Few women were able to resist the charm of his manner or the fascination of his tongue; he made conquests in every country in Europe, and, like all heartless Lotharios, he was inordinately vain of his easy successes. Although often betrothed, his 'insuper-'able objection to the marriage tie' always led him to break his vows. Everywhere he went he was courted by the highest in the land, all being curious to meet the marvellous adventurer who had escaped from 'The Leads.' He was received by Catherine of Russia and by George III.; Frederick the Great was impressed by his talents; he was a personal friend of the King of Poland. Occasionally he had periods of eclipse, due to financial embarrassments provoked by his extravagance. During a visit to England in 1763 he squandered £12,000 in less than twelve months. Sometimes he was in actual want, and was often driven to consort with the lowest associates when lack of money prevented him from seeking better company. No one, however, was more competent to live by his wits, and Madame d'Urfé and the senator Bragadin were ever ready to come to his assistance.

At last, in the autumn of 1774, he made his peace with the Venetian Republic and was allowed to return to his native city. A novel employment awaited him. His adoptive father was dead, and the French marchioness being no longer amenable it was necessary for him to earn his own living. In order to keep him out of mischief, the Inquisitors compelled him to become one of their secret agents. Naturally, he proved a most capable official, and the reports that he submitted to his employers—preserved still in the archives of

Venice—are a testimony to his zeal and acumen. Although, no doubt, the occupation was an uncongenial one, he found a solace in his literary work. During this period he made a translation of the 'Iliad' and published several volumes of miscellaneous essays. A description of a duel that he fought under extraordinary circumstances at Warsaw with the Polish General Branicki gained him almost as much renown as his escape from 'The Leads.'

At the end of nine years Casanova set out once more on his travels, and although a decree of parliament forbade him to enter Paris, he was unable to deny himself another visit to the French capital. To him, alas! it was now a changed city. Most of his friends were dead. Old beyond his years, the once dashing chevalier was incapable of repeating his former triumphs. The fierce, black eyes had lost their fire; the bold, aggressive air no longer inspired confidence. Women took little interest in the decayed rake; men perceived plainly that he was not to be trusted. One gift, however, had not faded with the passing of youth. As he had been all through his life, he was still an incomparable talker. It was owing to his conversational ability that he was preserved from an old age of penury when he came to the end of his resources and was unable to find a means of livelihood that would have maintained him in the position to which he was accustomed. Charmed by his lively wit and flow of anecdote, Count Waldstein, a Bohemian nobleman, offered him the post of librarian in his castle of Dux, near Teplitz. This appointment, which came to him in 1784, the tired wanderer accepted with gratitude, and then at last, in M. Samaran's words, 'les aventures 'de Casanova étaient finies.'

Yet it was impossible for a man of Casanova's temperament to endure such a situation contentedly. When the castle was full of guests, and he was encouraged to keep the table in a roar with jest and anecdote, he must have been conscious that he was there on show to amuse the visitors. The peevishness of old age increased the natural irritability of his disposition. If his soup was served too hot, or his plate of maçaroni was forgotten, he imagined that the chef intended a personal insult. During the long periods when Count Waldstein was travelling abroad the silence and loneliness of the great castle plunged the poor librarian into the deepest

gloom. He had a feud with the village priest, who, he complained, was trying to convert him ; he was always quarrelling with the servants. Had he not found occupation in writing the story of his career it is unlikely that he could have endured his solitude for so long. It is because of the unhappiness of the author while writing his autobiography that the Memoirs of Casanova are so poignant and real. In order to forget the present he sought relief in the splendid memories of the past, living his life over again in imagination as scarcely any other man has ever done. He survived almost until the end of the century, passing away at Dux on the 4th of June 1798, in his seventy-fifth year. ' J'ai vécu en philosophe,' were his dying words, ' et je meurs en chrétien.'

Eighteen months ago, in the spring of 1912, a most important contribution was made to Casanovian literature when Signor Aldo Ravà, an erudite Venetian, published a volume of letters which he had discovered in the archives of the castle of Dux, under the title, ' Lettere di Donne a Giacomo Casanova.' Recently these documents have been given further publicity by being translated into French by M. Edouard Maynial, another scholar of repute, who has named the book, ' Lettres ' de Femmes à Jacques Casanova.' These letters from the various conquests of the famous adventurer form a most interesting commentary upon the innumerable amours which he himself has described so minutely. They are not only useful as a check upon the truth of his statements, but by throwing light upon the characters of his correspondents they go far to make good his failure, to which attention was directed above, to give any living portraits of the ladies who flit across his pages. Unlike much of his own writing, these letters of women to Casanova are decorous throughout.

Most pathetic, perhaps, of any of the letters are those of pretty Manon Balletti, daughter of Silvia and Mario, the famous actor and actress of ' la Comédie Italienne ' in Paris. In Casanova's memoirs she is a shadowy, elusive personage, although he makes it evident that, with the exception of Henriette, he loved her more passionately than any of the numerous women whom he professed to adore. But in her correspondence with her lover—and they were affianced secretly for several years—the youthful Manon reveals her gentle soul. Sometimes the child of sixteen is distressed when she reflects that her temper

is not so good as it should be ; or she is worried by the matrimonial projects that her parents are making for her ; or her heart is sad because she fears that the affection of her lover is diminishing. ' Si j'ai de l'humeur vis-à-vis de vous, c'est ' parce que je me figure sottement que vous n'avez plus pour ' moi cette même tendresse qui fait mon bonheur et qui est ' la seule chose que je désire.' At other times she is full of optimism. ' Some day, my dear friend, we shall be happy,' she prophesies, with charming naïveté ; ' my heart tells me so, ' and my heart is a little oracle.'

When the restless Casanova had gone to Holland on government business the letters of the poor girl, who was tormented by doubts of his fidelity, became still more pitiful. Her face, she declares, is so disfigured by weeping that she fears he will love her no more on his return. She calls herself his little wife, and speaks of him as her dear husband. When eight days have elapsed without a letter she sends bitter reproaches. If he addresses her as ' Mademoiselle ' she is offended. Every time she writes she implores him to come back to her. She threatens to shut herself up in a convent. Still, notwithstanding her fondness and devotion, the romance ended as all the romances of Casanova were fated to end. According to the adventurer it was Manon herself who broke off the engagement, a cruel message that she sent to him a few days after his second visit to Holland informing him abruptly that she was going to become the wife of another man. Yet other letters to her lover, now published for the first time, show unmistakably that the poor girl was still faithful long after the period at which she is accused of being a jilt. And even while he reproaches her, Casanova acquits her of blame. ' I can see that Manon ' was very wise,' he declares, ' and that my love for self and ' not my love for her was wounded.'

There are two brief illiterate notes among these ' Lettres de ' Femmes ' that have proved to be a more emphatic vindication of the veracity of the memoirist than any other discovery of recent years. These two letters—the originals of which are preserved in the archives of Dux—were written to Casanova during his residence in London in 1763–4, by Marianne de Charpillon, the revengeful beauty who was the cause of his arrest and imprisonment. Previously the identity of this extraordinary woman had not been ascertained, but a series of

letters in the same handwriting, discovered recently in the MSS. Department at the British Museum, make it clear that she was the same person who enjoyed an unenviable notoriety ten years later as the *chère amie* of the famous John Wilkes.

All the latest information with which modern research has embellished the Memoirs of Casanova is contained in M. Charles Samaran's recently published work on the Venetian adventurer. The book is an excellent example of the French monograph at its best, graceful in style, precise and exhaustive in every detail. One can turn to it with confidence in the face of any difficulty, sure of learning all that antiquarian knowledge has promulgated. Not only is it a bibliographical text-book, but a short life of Casanova as well.

Many of the puzzles in the Memoirs are, of course, still unsolved. The personality of the sprightly Henriette, whom the adventurer seems to have loved more deeply than any of his inamoratas, remains a mystery. Anxious to conceal her identity, Casanova in all probability has led his readers astray purposely, disguising her age and asserting untruly that she became a countess. Strangely enough also, ' le renseignement ' topographique,' upon which M. Samaran rightly places most reliance, has yielded no result. Unless some of her letters can be found in the archives at Dux it is probable that the beautiful Frenchwoman will remain for ever *incognita*. Sometimes, no doubt, it is a matter of little regret that it should be impossible to identify the men or women whose folly or frailty even the indecorous Casanova has chosen to hide under a pseudonym. But it is by this microscopic examination that the truth of much of the autobiography has been established. In many instances Casanova himself has revealed inadvertently the full name of an individual elsewhere disguised under an initial. Thus, one of his unfortunate dupes, whom he calls Mademoiselle X.C.V., was obviously an English lady, named Justinienne Wynne, who afterwards married an Austrian count, Philip Orsini-Rosemberg, and became an authoress of some distinction. In like manner he discloses the identity of C.C. (i.e. Catherine Colonda), the young and charming Venetian girl, whom the senator Bragadin wished him to marry. There is some doubt, however, with regard to M. M., the beautiful nun of the island of Murano, whose true name is

of some importance in consequence of her association with the Abbé de Bernis.

Three instructive chapters in M. Samaran's book are devoted to Casanova's connexion with the French stage, and much that is new is told of his theatrical friends. As an archivist, M. Samaran has an intimate acquaintance with the reports of the police inspectors, Marais, Meusnier, and Sartines, who, in consequence of the elaborate system of espionage then in vogue, kept a daily record of Parisian life. Most of the singers and dancers of the French Opera or the Comédie-Italienne, with whom Casanova passed so much of his time in riot and revelry, are mentioned in these wonderful documents, their characters and personal appearance being described with a wealth of detail that is seldom displayed by the most careful chronicler. The son of an actress, with a flamboyant theatrical temperament that made him an actor in all the affairs of life, Casanova had a warm sympathy with anyone connected with the stage.

The labours of M. Samaran, who has summarised so succinctly all the Casanoviana of any value hitherto produced, throw the clearest light that has been yet directed upon the Memoirs as a whole. They have stood the test fairly well. Mistakes in dates there are in plenty. In particular, Casanova has made many errors in names, and some evasions with regard to his numerous expulsions from various towns. Again, all through the autobiography there are innumerable evidences of exaggeration. Though he protests that he is trying to state the exact truth, it was impossible for a man of his temperament to set down everything without malice or to withstand the temptations of romance. Still, most of these faults are exhibited, though in a lesser degree, in the letters of Horace Walpole, and indeed by every writer of memoirs in that or any period. While, then, it is necessary, as M. Samaran reminds his readers, to accept the uncorroborated testimony of Casanova with the greatest caution, enough of the autobiography has been approved by modern criticism to present a wonderful picture of society in the Eighteenth Century. Although the colouring may be extravagant in many places, the draughtsmanship for the most part is correct. The intelligent student, who takes the trouble to winnow the grain from the chaff, will find the Memoirs of Casanova a rich storehouse.

Naturally, the book is not for the general reader; but, as Mr. Charles Whibley remarks, 'no one, not already perverse, 'could be perverted by its gay and humorous romance.' Not the least of its merits, as the same brilliant critic has pointed out, is the wonderful impression its author gives of himself. This is, perhaps, the only piece of real portraiture that the work contains. There have been many assiduous students, like Casanova, who were also inveterate roisterers, as fond of the tavern as of the library, and some may have shown in an equal degree the same curious combination of pedantry and charlatanism, but though his conscience seems to have troubled him little with thoughts of the past, no sensualist was more anxious in the moments of his worst blackguardism that good should come out of the evil that he had wrought. Few who have been guilty of so much meanness have tried to do so many generous actions. Although his memoirs show him to have been a selfish egoist, and though their revelations of an unblushingly sensual life convey the impression that he was one of the most cynical of impostors, the offences that he committed were not so great as they seem at first sight. One need not feel any deep pity for the people who were his dupes. None of them appear to have suffered much on his account. The women, at least, were creatures of his own kind—light, inconstant, self-indulgent—and even the gentle Manon and the loving Henriette soon found consolation after he had ridden away.

Casanova, however, neither desired nor deserves the smallest apology. To regard him as anything but a pagan would be to misunderstand him. 'Folly,' he confesses, 'was the pre-'dominant element of my life.' His only philosophy was the Epicurean. 'To love and enjoy, to desire and to satisfy one's 'desires,' he declares of the human race, 'such is the circle 'in which we move and whence we never can be turned.' No woman was ever more vain. 'I have been always greedy of 'distinction,' he observes; 'I have always loved to draw the 'eyes of men towards me.' Grateful as a child for admiration, no one was more prone to take offence at imaginary disparagement. Yet, in spite of his delight in popular applause, he believed, like Thomas Carlyle, that 'fools were in the 'majority everywhere.' It is because of his singular freedom from cant that he enjoyed such a brilliant career. Regarding

the battle of life as a contest between knaves and fools, he was never obliged to swerve from his purpose by considerations of principle. More anxious to inspire reverence than affection, he preferred to attract satellites instead of friends, so as not to be obliged to share his successes with an accomplice. Thus, in the happy age of charlatanism he surpassed every other impostor by reason of his transparent hypocrisy, and will remain to the end of time the greatest trickster that history has ever known. A second Napoleon is far more possible than another such as he, for a great conqueror might well find a mission in the world, while a new Casanova would be an anachronism. The modern adventurer is now harnessed to the car of respectability, his talents stereotyped by convention, his opportunities limited by Acts of Parliament; and it is not under such conditions that memoirs can be written which future generations will care to read.

HORACE BLEACKLEY.

THE PIRATES OF ALGIERS

1. **Histoire de Barbarie.** By PIERRE DAN. Paris. 1637.
2. **Les derniers jours de la marine à rames.** By JURIEN DE LA GRAVIÈRE.
3. **Les corsaires barbaresques.** By L. S. DE CHÉNIER.
4. **Histoire générale d'Algérie.** By H. GARROT. Alger. 1910.
5. **The Scourge of Christendom.** By Sir R. L. PLAYFAIR. 1884.
6. **In the Desert.** By LISLE MARCH PHILLIPPS. Duckworth. 1912.

THE story of the Algerine pirates, though it has been often told, is unfamiliar to the average reader. The magnitude and duration of the episode are scarcely surmised, and the significance of the type which it brings into prominence, and the character which that type has maintained, still afford a field for observation. The subject is not one of burnt-out interest but vital, even affecting, through inherited Arab instincts, the politics of the present day.

Two great agents have combined to form the Arab nature: the desert which is its home, and the religion of which the sterner side has been developed and preserved by the forces of the desert. The men of the desert live in an enemy's land. They get by force and they keep by force. They have always preserved the same virile virtues which were conspicuous in the men of Western Europe in the Middle Ages. Their whole life is a training in wariness, vigilance, courage, and endurance; and Mohammedanism has given them a kind of emotional, if not national, unity and a tremendous incentive to action and conquest.

In the Spanish Moslems, driven out of Europe by Ferdinand and Isabella, cast upon the shores of North Africa, drawn once more into the old environment, the romantic nature, fanatical and impulsive, attained its full force. The position in which they were placed—the sea-line in front, the immemorial desert, with its fierce marauding hordes, stretching far behind—called their strong and poignant individuality into full play. It was out of their power to deal constructively

with the most fruitful of coast-lines, but leaders were able to organise roving bands in the name of conquest and terror, and to create the nucleus of those piratical States which were for centuries to be the scourge of 'all who desired to pass 'upon the seas on their lawful occasions.'

From the fall of Granada in 1492 to the death of Ali Pasha in 1580, the Pirate States were in the making. This was their Grand Period, when, under leaders like the Barbarossa, Dragut, and Ali, they arrayed themselves in line of battle against the powers allied for their destruction, and were recognised as foes of first-rate importance.

Roving bands of piratical marauders had not been unknown before this time, but they had not been of sufficient importance to interfere with the peaceful trading carried on for generations by Venetians and Genoese, Spaniards and Frenchmen. The power now forcing itself to the front practically held the sea at its mercy, and the forces of civilisation endeavoured in vain to cope with it.

The dwellers on the shores of the Mediterranean lived in constant dread of the swoop of the pirate galleys, and the ruins of the tall towers erected to spy out their approach still exist. Their excesses knew no moderation; sacked and burning towns and villages marked their course. On one expedition 11,000 slaves were captured between Reggio and Naples; on another, Pope Leo X. had a narrow escape from his villa by the sea; an attempt, which nearly proved successful, was made to carry off Marchesa Giulia Gonzaga, who had to mount and fly by night, while most of her retainers perished.

The first serious effort of Charles V. to conquer the pirates was made with a fleet numbering a personnel of 36,000 men of all nations. Beaten back and crippled by storms, it broke up and dispersed. A more successful expedition under Doria resulted in the taking of Tunis, amid scenes of awful massacre. This victory set free 20,000 captives, and though Keyr ed Din and a remnant of his force escaped to Algiers, his power was believed to be utterly crushed; but here again the starving and broken followers were drawn together as if by a magnet. In the following spring they were back at the old business, with thirty-two galleys at their command. The capture of Munona was carried out, and the prize of no fewer than 5700

Christians inaugurated a new period of gain and activity. By the end of the year 1538 there were 18,000 slaves in the Moorish arsenals and 400,000 gold pieces in the treasuries.

The engagement which took place two years later in the Gulf of Arta on the Greek coast is memorable as being the last battle fought with galleys. The Spaniards already possessed some sailing ships, while the Venetians for the first time were armed with great guns. In dead silence the Christian fleet waited while the galleys came on ; then at last the guns spoke. The execution they did was terrible, and though for a space it seemed as if the overwhelming numbers of the corsairs might still prevail, the whole combat was a triumph of discipline and gunnery for the Venetians. Barbarossa drew off, leaving the galleons of Venice victorious.

Barbarossa died in his bed eight years later. For years after no Turkish ship left the Golden Horn without her crew repeating a prayer and firing a salute in honour of the great admiral. Indomitable fighters carried on his tactics. Ali Pasha, a Christian renegade, was one of the boldest captains in the Mediterranean. The shields he took from the Knights of St. John, after defeating them at Tunis, were hanging for centuries in the gate of the Marina at Algiers. His career was checked by Sebastian Venier, the grand old sea-dog of Venice, at the battle of Lepanto in 1571. A peculiar element of fierce hatred entered into this combat ; for the atrocious cruelty of the Turkish forces, who, after a prolonged siege, had taken Famagosta and flayed alive the heroic governor, Bragadin, had roused the Venetians to fury. Well might Venice load her admiral with honours, and commission Tintoretto to immortalise the famous fight on canvas. It stands upon a par with the victory of Charles Martel. Had the day gone otherwise, it seems possible that Venice might have become a port of the Turks and Algerines.

Lepanto may indeed be taken as a turning point. Up to that moment the powers of order and disorder had been more or less evenly matched. From that time the whole character of Algerine warfare was changed. The pirates no longer invited great contests, or tried to extend their kingdom. Their aim was plunder, not open war. ' The Algerines are robbers and ' I am the chief ' said the Dey of Algiers to the English Consul in 1641. Yet even as robbers the Pirate States made good their

right to the recognition of European Powers to an extent which strikes a reader of the present day with bewilderment. Consuls were appointed to them, and the Powers not only tolerated a race of savages in their midst, but kings and princes stooped to enter into diplomatic relations with them, and bargained for the safe passage of their ships with ruffians who held thousands of their subjects in slavery.

The imagination fails to grasp all that is implied by the words 'a capture of 5000 slaves,' 'twenty thousand Christian 'slaves in the Moorish arsenals,' and other such phrases. Yet the world hardly holds a history of greater misery than that inflicted on mankind by the Pirate States which for four hundred years dominated the Mediterranean. Many of those who endured captivity and escaped, or were ransomed, have left records, minute and circumstantial, of their experiences, some of which will hardly bear telling to modern ears; but we may gather from the narratives of Miguel de Cervantes, or Jean Martelli de Bergerac, or Pierre Dan, an outline of what life was like in those white Arab towns which gleam above the dark blue sea.

The equipages of the Arab navy, as described by Jurien de la Gravière, J. M. de Bergerac, and Chénier, were divided into soldiers, sailors, officers of marine, and a number of extra officers to take charge of captured vessels. Until the supersession of rowing galleys by sailing ships, which did not take place till the end of the seventeenth century, about three hundred slaves were allotted to a large galley. They occupied some twenty benches, three feet apart on either side of the ship, every oar being manœuvred by three men, while the overseers stood on a raised footway in the middle and ran up and down the ranks, dealing blows with knotted sticks and kourbashes.

The galleys appear to have been skilfully constructed to get the fullest power out of the crew. Long and narrow, with slight depth of hold, a galley of 125 to 128 feet—or 180 feet including poop and prow—would only have a beam of about 19 feet and a depth of hold of 7 feet 6 inches. The rowers were all Christian prisoners, for it was impossible to induce free men to toil at the oar. The men rowed partly sitting, partly standing, loosely chained to the benches. The right foot was placed upon the bench in front, and at a given signal by whistle, each man leapt from his seat and, poising

himself on the next, bent forward, throwing all his weight on the long and immensely heavy oar. Their trained muscles were capable of tremendous exertion, and a galley was sometimes pulled thus for ten, twelve, and even twenty hours without a moment's rest. The guard in such a stress would put pieces of bread soaked in wine into the rowers' mouths, and then the captain might shout the order to redouble the lash that urged to fresh exertions.

Jean de Bergerac, a Frenchman who was a prisoner about 1701 and afterwards made his escape, writes:

'Those who have not seen a galley at sea, chasing or being chased, cannot well conceive the shock such a spectacle must give to a heart capable of the least pity. It is to behold ranks of half-naked wretches chained to the plank from which they remove not for months together, urged on by cruel and repeated blows to an incessant continuance of the most violent of all exercises and this for whole days and nights, which often happens in a fierce chase. . . . If a slave falls exhausted at his oar, which is often the case, he is flogged till he is left for dead and then pitched unceremoniously into the sea.'

Three cakes a day, steeped in water or vinegar, was the food allowance. On shore the rowers lived in the bagnio. The Bagnio del Rey at Algiers was situated in what is now the Rue du Marché, lying between the Bab (gate) Azyoum and the Bab-el-Oued, and was composed of little dark, damp cells opening upon an inner court. A careful captain did not allow the muscles of his crew to stiffen, and after a few days' rest the galley resumed the exercises which, whether at sea or not, were used to keep the men in condition.

Cruelty, overwork, insufficient nourishment, frequent epidemics, and mental suffering gave rise to terrible mortality both on sea and shore. Since piracy had become a regular institution, hundreds of thousands of Christians had died in captivity. Even the few who were better treated underwent the worst pangs mortal can endure in the loss of home, country, and liberty. At the end of the sixteenth century there were reputed to be 20,000 slaves in Algiers, and an equal number was scattered through the interior; but the waste of life was so great that the numbers required continually renewing.

Woe betided the trading ship, going peacefully on its way, that sighted a phalanx of the dreaded galleys rowing hard

in chase. The ship itself, before sailing vessels came into use, was manned by oarsmen, convicts, and prisoners of war, but the efficiency for extreme speed was less severely maintained. The relentless pursuers gained upon her. Often some predatory instinct, like that of a bird of prey, seemed to draw others to the scent, so that a dozen or fifteen craft might have to be reckoned with. The Algerine pirates never attacked at night and preferred calm weather, 'the breeze 'a kiss from heaven, the sea a million dimples of liquid gold.'

Brave men were often on board the trader and they had every inducement to sell their lives dearly, but they had little chance against the fierce and seasoned pirate crews. Now and again a story is told of a desperate and successful resistance. Once, the rowers of the corsair fleet, on a preconcerted signal, threw down their oars at the approach of the Venetians, and 3000 Christians were released from the galleys which their action had rendered helpless. But these were isolated events; usually the prize was overpowered after a bloody engagement and was carried with the survivors into the city whose ill-omened name was but too familiar to all seafarers.

As the fleet came in sight of the white city on the hillside, cannon fired at intervals announced a fruitful voyage. The captured standard was hoisted, and the guards lashed the rowers to make the craft fly. When the galleys dropped anchor, the first thing to do was to take the oars and sails on shore, so as to preclude the possibility of the crews making off. Khabyles, Moors, Jews, renegades, a mob which included every country and spoke every jargon, poured out of the Barbagira gate, mad with joy, drowning the noise of the cannon with their shouts as they crowded on the quay. Then from each boat, which lay like a bird without wings, the captives and the booty were disembarked.

Officials, empowered to take a seventh part of the prize for the Pasha, made a selection from among the unhappy prisoners, and the long, sad procession set off for the palace: a terrible march for hidalgos of illustrious name, for worthy merchants, decent traders, brave sailors, and, above all, for noble and modest women who had a fate worse than death in prospect. As they stumbled through the narrow streets where two could hardly walk abreast, there was still a faint

hope that in the crowd might be Christian merchants, tolerated in the country because they were useful, who might recognise and befriend fellow-countrymen, but it was a hope rarely justified. Those captives who looked like work-people were set to their special trades or drafted off to the State factories, the youngest and most vigorous being devoted to the galleys. Others whose good clothes and white hands denoted their higher position were detained in hopes of a ransom. When the seventh part had been chosen, the rest, gentlemen, soldiers, priests, and women, were made over to the corsairs who had captured them, and were sent next day to the public market to be sold to the highest bidder. The younger women and the boys disappeared into the harems. The little girls were made over to the vilest women to be brought up to a life of prostitution.

What is singular is the order with which operations essentially disorderly were carried out. The papers on board the captured ship had been examined by the Reis or captain, to ascertain the value of the cargo and the status of the passengers, and the Khodja or secretary kept a list of the booty and the persons. The largest number of Christians became slaves in private families. Hardly a Moorish household was too poor to possess one. All the heavy work fell to their lot. They washed clothes, ground corn in the hand-mills, cut wood and burned charcoal, worked in the fields, and when there was not enough to do at home, the master hired out his slave as a porter or to row in a private galley ; sometimes to pursue a trade and to bring home the profits. One slave might have the good fortune to secure a kind master, while another fell under the rule of a fanatic or brutal tyrant, perhaps a negro or a renegade. All, even the best treated, were despised as Christians, reviled, insulted, and pelted in the streets. It sometimes happened that Moors and Jews, refugees from Spain, burning to avenge their banishment and the ill-treatment of their race, would buy Spanish captives, and dragging them to a public place, would enjoy the solace of stoning them to death.

All prisoners had but one dream—to escape. Many cheated their captors by drowning or hanging themselves. Some took to sea in small boats, badly furnished with provisions and water ; others who knew the Arab tongue, disguised in bournous and

turban, hiding by day and journeying by night, attempted to reach the Spanish town of Oran, 110 leagues from Algiers. More often than not the little barque was swallowed up in a storm, and of those who tried to escape by land almost all were brought back in chains. For these the Moors were implacable, both from inclination and on principle. They were impaled, beaten to death, broken on the wheel or burned alive, or if the master did not wish to lose his slave, he merely cut off his nose and ears. Nor were the efforts at revolt which took place from time to time more successful, and the conspirators who failed perished by thousands in the repression which followed.

Some 500 captives belonging to the King were employed on public works as architects, painters, carpenters, and builders. True to their practice of getting others to do for them what they were too indolent or too volatile to do for themselves, the Arabs used these captives to design palaces and mosques, to make roads, to cast cannon, to manufacture ball and powder, to construct galleys and brigantines. Better fed and better treated than their fellow slaves, they came and went freely. One of their number, rising to be chief engineer and being allowed a separate dwelling, obtained permission to have a private chapel to which all the Christian women in Algiers resorted. These men of a high rate of skill were, however, unfortunate in that their services were so valuable that they could hardly ever hope to be admitted to ransom.

Every nation in Europe and every rank of society were represented among the enslaved. In the long list we find a Viceroy, two eldest sons of peers of Scotland (the Masters of Morton and Polwarth who spent nine years in captivity), the great writer Miguel de Cervantes, St. Vincent de Paul, men of the highest eminence in science and arms, delicately nurtured ladies, and little children doomed to a life of infamy. The great majority of those captured never returned to their native land. The most favoured were allowed to keep taverns, and sometimes amassed a sufficient sum to purchase their discharge.

It is not surprising that, in their miserable condition, a certain number of Christians should have sought to mitigate their suffering by embracing the Mohammedan faith. With conversion they could aspire to higher conditions and even become pachas. Hassan Agha, who defended Algiers against Charles V. in 1541, was a Sardinian ; Giraldj Ali, a bey in 1568,

was a Neapolitan renegade; a Venetian became pacha of Algiers, and at one time that city numbered 8000 renegades in its service. An Englishman, Sir Francis Verney, on the lookout for a life of adventure, broken and dishonoured in his own country, joined the corsairs early in the seventeenth century, and was distinguished for his courage and cruelty. The renegades knew that no Christian community would receive them again, and they encountered European attacks with the resistance of lost and desperate men. But the Mussulman law, while not allowing that one of the faithful should be enslaved, did not recognise the right to liberty in those whose profession was made after they had been taken captive. It was an age in which religious belief was strong, and many unhappy beings endured infinite suffering rather than deny their faith. The hope of being ransomed died hard; a Christian fleet might appear off the port; and if these expectations faded with the years, at least their constancy would be rewarded in the land where all prisoners are free.

At the beginning of the seventeenth century the construction of square-sailed ships had begun. A Flemish rover designed them for Algiers. In Tunis an Englishman, helped by a Greek renegade, rendered the same service. Fifty years later the Algerine maritime force was composed of seventy corsairs, mounting from twenty-five to thirty pieces of cannon each. With Tunis and Tripoli the whole Barbary fleet numbered 120 sailing ships, besides galleys.

A nation of sailors, they soon mastered the altered methods of navigation. According to the description given by L. S. de Chénier:

'The new vessel, the caramanzel, stands high out of the water, is strong and swift, mounts 18 to 20 guns and is manned by sixty well-armed pirates. From its commanding height its guns can pour down so furious a fire that the only alternative to surrender is positive extirpation. Even if the Christians succeed in boarding they find themselves in a trap . . . the hurricane decks at poop and prow command the boarding party, a hail of grape pours from the guns and seizing their opportunity the corsairs take their opponents in front and rear and there comes a busy time for scimitar and pike.'

Equally vivid is the account given by Diego de Haedo in 1612:

'The Algerines are out upon the cruise the whole year round and are so devoid of dread that they roam the Eastern and Western seas, laughing all the while at the Christian galleys, which lie trumpeting and gaming and banqueting in the ports of Christendom, as if they went a-hunting hares and rabbits. Nay, far from being under apprehension, they are certain of their game, since their galliotts are so exceedingly light and nimble and in such excellent order, whereas on the contrary the Christian galleys are so heavy, so embarrassed and in such bad order that it is utterly in vain to think of giving chase or of preventing them coming and going and doing just as they please. When at any time the Christian galleys chase them, their custom is by way of jeer, to point to their freshly tallowed poops as they glide along like fishes.'

The corsairs prided themselves on the ship-shape appearance of their vessels; everything was stowed away with marvellous neatness; the anchor was lowered into the hold; and when chasing, no unnecessary movement of any kind was permitted to the crew or soldiers.

With these newly built galleons the rovers pushed their successes farther afield. There seemed no limit to their daring. They still kept their favourite course along the Levant, where passed the ships laden with the products of Bombay or Cairo, or they lay at the back of Cyprus and raided the Italian coast; but in 1617 their sailing vessels bore down upon Madeira and laid waste the whole island, pillaged churches, and brought 800 men, women, and children back to Algiers. Ten years later, Murad Reis, a Fleming, took the Algerine ships as far as Denmark and Iceland, whence he carried off a number of victims. In 1631 the same captain sacked the port of Baltimore in Ireland and carried 237 inhabitants into captivity, a raid from which the town never recovered. An eye-witness writes:

'It was a piteous sight to see them exposed for sale, for then they parted the wife from the husband and the father from the child. They sold the husband here, the wife there, tearing from her arms the daughter she cannot ever hope to see again. So many honest girls, so many well brought up women, abandoned to the brutality of these barbarians.'

Even the coasts of England were at length alarmed by the appearance of Algerine pirates, who came under the guidance of English and Dutch renegades. In 1625 Penzance petitioned Parliament for a fort, 'because of late terribly 'terrified by the Turks.' Nor was their terror groundless, for a few months later the Mayor of Plymouth writes to the

Council that within ten days twenty-seven vessels with two hundred men had been taken. In 1644 a yet more daring raid was reported, when Edward Rossingham writes to Lord Conway: 'Those roguish pirates which lie upon the West 'Coast have taken from the shore about Penzance, near St. 'Michael's Mount, sixty men, women and children.'

These victims were seized in a church in Megavissey Bay by a landing party. How can we express the terror and despair of it all, how rouse the imagination to picture a scene so alien to English country life, even in that distant day, how conjure up a vision of those decent Cornish folks assembled at Divine Service on that peaceful Sunday morning? The familiar prayers, the psalms and hymns; in the combes outside lay the farms and cottages and vicarage waiting for the return of the dwellers, sheltering all the hopes and plans for work and pleasure, for courtship and marriage and happy neighbourly intercourse, born of peace and security. And then the sudden wild alarm, the apparition of the fierce raiders in their strange Eastern dresses, armed with knife and sabre, pouring with wild cries into the quiet aisles. The hopeless resistance of unarmed men, the shrieks and slaughter, the terrible voyage and more terrible landing. Gone the whole scheme of English life; lovers, husbands, wives parted for ever. Gone the greys and greens of the dear Cornish home, and beneath skies like brass, amid blinding glare and foreign sights and sounds, the fate of a lost soul in Hell and the prospect of lifelong slavery and torture.

Now and again the pirates caught a Tartar. A Looe ship having been taken, the crew retook her, and, killing those on deck and shutting down thirty-two men under hatches, brought her in triumph to St. Ives. But on the whole the Cornish coast was so blockaded that not even fishermen dared to go out when the Mediterranean pirates could be sighted from the shore. They took 300 vessels and many hundreds of men in a few years, and were not swept out of the Channel till the increased and well-administered fleet of the Commonwealth enabled the Government to police the waters systematically.

What would the Algerines have been without their captives? The inhabitants of these sea towns were little addicted to labour. They could not have lived secure from the depredations of the hinterland if they had not kept their warlike character.

It was the Christian slaves who raised the mole of the port and the encircling walls, and built palaces, mosques, prisons, and ships. It was the gold poured out in ransom which paid the janissaries and filled the treasure of their King and enriched private families. Without the work and the gold of the Christians, Algiers, which had no commerce or industries, would have had no status at all. It lived upon slavery, persisted in long after the consent of civilised life had abandoned slavery among European races, while the whole treatment of the Christians was aggravated by the character of the Arab, who did not even understand the policy of caring for his beast of burden.

We have already touched upon the great expeditions organised in earlier days against this scourge of the Mediterranean. It would be impossible to give even an outline of the many that followed; but while the Christians often seemed to be victorious, the recuperative power of Algiers was marvellous. This power of rising again after the worst disasters throws considerable light on the character of the inhabitants, for it can only signify that in piracy they had found the occupation which appealed to the instincts of the race. They could no more help pillaging and raiding than a cat can help scratching or a dog can help barking. Piracy was their gift, their vocation. The blows dealt to them would effectually have staggered any ordinary enterprise and crippled any ordinary trade. But piracy was more to the Arabs than an ordinary trade or enterprise. It was an instinct and an appetite. Hence they needed no goading or persuasion to re-establish their fallen fortunes.

Spain, perhaps the greatest sufferer, tried again and again to exterminate them. Louis XIV.'s greatest admiral, Du Quesne, made war upon them. The Dutch sent De Ruyter with a fleet of tall ships. He sunk the largest vessels and delivered hundreds of slaves, but three years after things were as bad as ever. England's attempts were not particularly glorious, and the outbreak of the Civil War in 1640 stopped them altogether for a time. Blake gave Tunis a lesson in 1655, when he bombarded it and blew the fortifications to pieces, but though this ensured the prompt acceptance of his terms by Algiers, the treaty was never observed. Under Pasha, Agha, Dey or Bey, as the Algerine governors were successively styled, the same operations went on. Between 1674 and

1686 no fewer than 350 English vessels and over 5000 prisoners were brought into Algiers alone. It was during the corruption and confusion of the navy under Charles II. that the shameful agreement was concluded which recognised the right of the pirates to hold English captives if their friends were unable to pay a reasonable ransom. The Turk was merely the nominal suzerain, but the Sultan continued to resent any attack upon town and forts. A breach with Turkey meant the ruin of the Turkey trade, which by this time was of great importance, and the Levant Company opposed all proposals of vigorous action. Merchants and traders, tired of asking their own rulers for protection, were willing to pay the robbers for exemption, and by the end of the seventeenth century all the European Powers were in the position of tributary States, paying a tax to Algiers to secure their merchantmen from pillage. After 1583 their consuls nominally occupied the position of envoys to a friendly nation. But at best that position was precarious. On one occasion, when an English consul asked the Pasha for a safe conduct for English ships, the Pasha replied that on the contrary he hoped to take some of them that year; when an attack on the town was being made by French ships their consul was blown to them from a gun together with forty other Europeans.

As early as the days of Elizabeth, letters had been addressed to the Bey from the Queen herself, and from the Lord High Admiral. Later we find Sir Francis Collingham, ambassador to Spain, writing to the Duke of Buckingham:

'The strength and boldness of the Barbary pirates is now grown to that height as I have never known anything to have wrought a greater sadness in the Court than the daily notice thereof. . . . Two big English ships they drove ashore not four leagues from Malaga and to this day they remain before Malaga preventing all trade with that part of Spain.'

The great obstacle to united action lay in the jealousy and rivalry of the European Powers, none of whom could endure that another should occupy Algiers, Tunis, or Tripoli. Short of such occupation there was no hope of success, as the Arabs observed no treaties and, scattering like sand before attack, they collected again as soon as the attack was over.

The eighteenth century inherited all the international rivalries and cupidities which made for the dissension and

the weakness of Christendom. The Spanish Government was glad to buy peace with a million piastres, but such a peace could only last as long as the piastres did. The position of Algiers was never defined with more simple humour and accuracy than by the Dey in answer to an expostulation of the Dutch. 'We *must* take prizes. We have been at peace 'so long that all our privateers are weary of it. We must 'break with some of you.'

In the sixteenth century only a small sum was asked in ransom, but by the seventeenth £120 to £300 was a common demand. No limit was set to the price of a person of distinction. In 1670 the Governor of the Canaries bought his freedom for 60,000 livres. The ransom paid, there were other dues to reckon with; to the customs, the Pacha or Dey, the captain of the fort, and keeper of the prison. Some few persons were promptly ransomed, but many of those whose names are preserved in the lists had been slaves for ten, twenty, and over thirty years. Master carpenters and those employed on the fleet could not be bought off at any price.

Although the Powers of Europe failed to check the ravages of the pirates, Christian charity was zealous and courageous in carrying relief to the victims. From an early date in the sixteenth century, Spanish Fathers, versed in the Berber and Arab tongues, carried medical learning into the service of the Pachas and profited by the opportunity to organise work among the slaves. The missionaries of the Order of the Trinity and of the Redemption of Captives were followed by those of the Maturins and of Our Lady of Mercy. St. Vincent de Paul, who had himself escaped from the Moors and knew all the horrors of captivity, founded the *Œuvre des Esclaves* in 1665. These vicars were able to ensure a certain consideration. They had access to the prisons and could search for those more fortunate persons whom their families sought to reclaim. They founded hospitals and chapels, took care of the slaves in sickness, helped and sustained them in body and soul, and gave them Christian burial. By their courage, patience, and self-denial the priests gained the toleration and respect of the wild Moors, who often insisted on their Christian slaves attending Mass, shrewdly remarking that they returned more docile and more resigned. Such societies continued to be organised in France through the eighteenth century. A noble of France, who concealed his real title under

the name of Padre Giuseppe, sold all his estates and came to Algiers in the latter part of the century. He was then in the prime of life and lived to the age of eighty, devoting his every moment to the service of his unfortunate brethren, by whom he was worshipped.

Constant questions were asked in the British Parliament. Applications for grants were frequent. A resolution was passed to the effect that fines levied on members who were late for prayers were to be distributed among 'the poor women who '*daily attend the house* on behalf of their kidnapped husbands.' Lord Nelson expressed a wish to take order with the miscreants, but adds 'With the French fleet ready to put to sea, I have no 'time.'

In 1816 Lord Exmouth repeated, on a grander scale, Blake's exploit at Tunis. The Algerine fleet by this time numbered no more than thirty-seven vessels. These were burnt, the batteries were silenced, and the forts reduced to heaps of ruins. About 12,000 Christian captives were released, and it seemed as if the long misrule was at an end; but even in these straits the Algerines, true to themselves, could not accept defeat. Lord Exmouth drew off, and in an incredibly short time the forts were rebuilt and depredations began again.

No terms of civilised nations had at any time been observed with the consuls, who on any menace from outside were liable to be insulted, threatened and imprisoned. The Danish consul, in 1810, was heavily ironed and confined in the slaves' Bagnio. The venerable Dutch consul, who had held the post for twenty-five years, was marched to the arsenal, fainting under the load of his chains, and died of apprehension and agony of mind, threatened with the selling by auction of his wife and children. The young wife of the English consul, Mrs. Macdonald, was assisted to escape, with her child, by a young officer, Captain (afterwards Admiral) Dashwood. The fact that he was the grandfather of the present writer, who can recollect hearing him, as a very old man, tell the story, connects the pirates' reign very closely with our own day.

At last a public insult from the Bey to a French consul—only a blow with a fan, but stronger to shape events than the firing of a consul from a gun a hundred years earlier—gave France a pretext for sending a fleet and an army to the Barbary shores.

The Arabs were not unprepared. Day by day their forces poured in from the hinterland. Thousands of Arabs and

Khabyles flocked to the standard, till, without counting the townspeople, 50,000 fighting men were assembled. But the resources of civilisation at last prevailed. The French, with a fleet of 200 warships and 500 transports carrying 40,000 soldiers, effected a landing on a promontory six leagues from Algiers. A party of their comrades had been wrecked on the coast and taken prisoners, and their heads, for which the Bey had given a reward of 500 francs apiece, had been shot into the French lines as cannon balls. This, the last of the devilish pleasantries of the pirates, had aroused in their assailants a fury equal to their own. With desperate courage, the French fought their way to a position near the city from which they could bring their big guns into action. A German prisoner in the city, Dr Pfeiffer, has left us some account of the effects of that fire and, indeed, of the city generally, and of the demeanour of its inhabitants under the stress of the bombardment. Flimsily built, of bad plaster, the rickety Moorish houses, crowded and clustered together, with scarce room between for the narrow and tortuous alleys which wound through them, went down like card houses under the French fire, blocking up the narrow passages in their fall, and burying many of the inhabitants in their ruins. On all sides, writes the German, was to be heard the wailing cry: 'It is the will of Allah.'

Yet even in this extremity, and even when the capitulation of the town was enforced and the measured tread of European troops sounded for the first time within its walls, it is doubtful whether the Arabs realised the situation. Their city had many a time been bombarded, and each time they had made good the damage and reconstructed their business. Assuredly it never occurred to the Moors but that in due course the French would retire to their ships and sail away. Like smoked-out wasps, when the fire had burnt out they would then return to their harried nest and set about the task of reconstruction. It was only by slow degrees that disillusionment came. Gradually, and after many fierce revolts, the Arab has realised that the French conquerors have come to stay.

A marble tablet placed at the entrance to the fort of Sidi-Feneh bears the inscription: 'Ici, le XIV Juin, MDCCCXXX, 'par ordre du roi, Charles X., sous le commandement du 'Général de Bourmont, l'Armée française vint arborer ses 'drapeaux, rendre la liberté aux mers, donner l'Algérie à la 'France.'

The moral to be drawn from the long story is that the love of enslaving is an ineradicable vice of the Arab. It is much more than a social evil resulting from conditions that pass. It is his natural tendency and genius. 'The panic created 'by his appearance,' remarks the author of 'In the Desert,' 'the flight, the pursuit, the capture, the ruin left behind, 'are rapture to the Arab.' Only as slave-owners and slave-traders have the Arabs ever been able to obtain any ascendancy. They have been driven back upon their own ground, and the story of their rule in the interior is in all essentials the story of Algiers. The pirates of the Mediterranean have become the pirates of the desert. Blackened, ruined, deserted villages mark the place of once thriving peaceful communities—a few miserable survivors tell the tale of unprovoked assault, of merciless massacre, of wholesale slavery. The country round Tangier and Morocco bears the same witness. The French took Algiers with the intention of evacuating it when law and order had been established. We proposed to take the same course when the Mahdi was driven back, but the Arab returned to carry on the slave trade as vigorously as before. This is the justification for the African conquests made by Western nations in Algeria, in Tripoli, and in Morocco; for the Arab cannot assimilate law and order and must fly before it.

The surviving significance of the Arab problem consists largely in this: that being routed and obliged to fly, the Arab has a sure refuge to fly to. Were it not for the desert the Arab episode would already be ancient history. The last marauders would have been hunted out of their fastnesses, the rule of the strong hand would have been enforced, and the instinctive lawlessness of the race, instead of finding work for European administrators and soldiers, would merely be engaging the notice of students. When the Arabs diverted their attention from the sea to the desert, they both gained and lost by the exchange. The sandy waves of the Sahara carried no argosies. It was a poor and starved existence which the Bedouins of the Sahara lived in comparison with that of the earlier buccaneers. The trans-Saharan caravan trade, never extremely lucrative, declined steadily beneath the attentions of the robber tribesmen. The system of plunder applied both to the villages and the trade routes has dried up what under more provident management might have been

a permanent source of revenue. But with the terrible poverty it has brought upon the race, the Sahara has also brought comparative safety. It is doubtful if there is elsewhere on the earth's surface another such area of land capable of maintaining life in a specially trained and acclimatised people and yet so inaccessible to surrounding nations. It is an improvement even on the Arabian desert. Inured to the conditions here prevailing, the typical Arab, totally unprogressive, the natural enemy of society, can still survey a hostile world with a certain equanimity. Not till Europe has conquered the Sahara will it really have overcome the Arab.

With the logic of their race the French have seized the points at issue, and the energy with which they have developed the boring of wells, and their zeal in enlarging existing oases and originating fresh ones are indications of the thought-out system of conquest which they are pursuing. Certain parts of the Northern Sahara, as the Oued Reis valley, are already sprinkled with tufts of green from the frequent date-groves of the French oases. Society has foothold here, and a certain stability of existence invites the principles of law and order and progress to establish themselves; but an impression has scarcely been made on that vast waste over which the nomad tribes wander, driving their lean herds from one scanty pasture to another. This is the true Arab kingdom. There is none to dispute his right in a land where none but he can support existence. His enemies hunt him out of accessible and stable regions; they wrest his conquests from him; they pursue him to the verge of the waste; but beyond that boundary they are helpless. These solitudes belong to him as much as the solitudes of the southern seas belong to the long-winged albatross, whose bodily structure and mode of flight have adapted it to that environment. After all, what defence of coast or crag or battlemented wall is as impregnable as those leagues of waterless sand? Many fortifications have yielded to the attacks of modern science, but the security of the Arab still holds. 'A privacy of glorious light is his,' and from that fastness, itself uncivilised, he glares forth at Western civilisation with a gaze as inveterately hostile to-day as ever it was in the times when he and his foes were matched on more equal terms.

Evelyn March Phillipps.

THE NEED OF PREVENTIVE DETENTION

Rules, dated April 24, 1911, made by the Secretary of State under the Prison Act, 1898, and the Prevention of Crime Act, 1908, for Persons undergoing Preventive Detention, together with a Memorandum by the Secretary of State, dated February 16, 1911.

THE very successful kind of passive resistance which the habitual criminal has constantly offered to all the schemes, corrective or reformatory, devised from time to time for his reclamation, serves to demonstrate the impotence of the law either to tame his recidivist spirit, or to alter his moral outlook and turn him into a respectable citizen. To a certain extent indeed it may be argued that not only has the law failed to rehabilitate or deter him, but legal procedure has even assisted him in his career, and brought recidivism to its present flourishing state. When, as a consequence of the Summary Jurisdiction Act of 1879, long sentences of penal servitude were finally abolished, many persons who lived by crime, and who had formerly spent long periods of their lives in prison, at once gained a considerable increase of free time, and, with it, increased opportunities for the exercise of their calling. Of these opportunities they took full advantage ; and since that time recidivism has been rampant. The last report of the Prison Commissioners, 1912–13, shows that 87 per cent. of men sentenced to penal servitude in that year had previous convictions recorded against them. It is found accordingly by the authorities that the same set of recurrent criminals are constantly committing the same kind of offences against the law ; that they are generally dealt with under a system of diminishing penalties which extends their freedom for mischief ; and, finally, that the great bulk of the really serious crime of the country lies at the door of these persistent enemies of society.

There are good grounds for thinking that these facts, which are well known to criminologists, have not sufficiently impressed themselves on the minds of Parliament or the public. At any

rate the policy of dealing with them—based on a spirit of humanitarianism which makes but little appeal to a seasoned type of expert criminal—has been so halting and irresolute that the professional recidivist has been allowed to continue his career, gaining strength as he goes; to perfect his criminal training and accomplishments in his intervals of freedom; and incidentally to work out his own moral ruin—all at the expense of a long-suffering public.

To meet these conditions, and with the threefold purpose of discouraging the *crime habit*, of affording some belated relief to society, and of giving the criminal himself a chance of retrieving his respectability, a scheme of preventive detention has been devised, and is now embodied in an Act of Parliament —The Prevention of Crime Act, 1908. No legislative enactment of recent times equals this Prevention of Crime Act in the controlling influence it exerts on criminality in the present, or in the encouraging promise it holds out of still better things in the future. It is therefore of the utmost importance that the Act should be administered by the authorities resolutely, and that its provisions and intentions should be carried out in such a way as to give this latest statutory remedy for recidivism a fair chance of fulfilling its purpose. Signs however are not wanting that the objects aimed at may not be fully attained, owing to some feebleness in the process of administration.

The Act, it may be premised, strikes at habitual criminality in two ways, and is separated into two parts which are complementary the one of the other. Part I., which has nothing to do with preventive detention, establishes the Borstal Institution as a permanent factor in the treatment of the younger class of criminals. Part II., on the other hand, establishes preventive detention, and deals with an older class. Under the provisions of Part I. youths of the impressionable age of sixteen to twenty-one, who have already shown proficiency in, and aptitude for, crime to such an extent as to render them potential and probable recruits for penal servitude later in their career, are segregated in Borstal Institutions where they are specially trained, taught, and equipped with some trade or handicraft by which they can earn an honest living. On discharge they are handed over to an after-care Association which finds them work, supervises them, and supplies them with such moral and material help as their cases demand—the general end aimed

at being that they should be rescued in time, and diverted from evil courses which would lead them inevitably into the ranks of professional recidivism.

This beneficent scheme, which was started tentatively several years ago by the Prison Commissioners at Borstal Prison (from which it derives its name), has now been considerably extended and its working facilitated by the powers given to the Courts, under the Act of 1908, to commit young offenders *direct* to the Borstal Institutions. Already there are three of these intercepting establishments in existence with several hundreds of inmates undergoing the prescribed training. The results are satisfactory beyond question. Crime is diminishing rapidly amongst the young; recruits for recidivism are falling off; and the total numbers of habitual and professional criminals in the higher walks of crime are decreasing year by year. Part I. of the Act, therefore, may be said to have already proved its success. There remains, however, one slight hitch in the mode of administration which hampers the Institution authorities. Although every inmate can expedite his own release by good conduct, industry, and attention to instruction, the Courts still show reluctance to commit youths for the *full period* of three years' training. It is probable that this difficulty will disappear when the good effects of the system, and the importance of the objects aimed at, are better understood.

It may be conceded at once in regard to Part II. of the Act, which prescribes preventive detention for habitual criminals of more mature years and more settled habits, that it is never likely to effect such striking results, or to make such a permanent mark on the statistics of crime, as Part I. is now accomplishing. Habitual criminals, with a crazy code of their own to unlearn, do not take kindly to the moral training and discipline which are essential for their rehabilitation. Moreover they are already well versed in the ways of the reformer, having undergone, for the most part in vain, all kinds of treatment designed for their improvement, varying from mild remonstrances and impressive warnings at one end of the scale to long terms of penal servitude at the other. Men who have spent a great part of their lives in trying to evade the snares and meshes of the criminal law are apt to look askance at the benevolent designs of the moralist, and to regard the tempting but unsophisticated bait offered them

by the reformer as a pitiful contrivance for enticing them from their congenial occupations.

The experiment that is now on trial under the name of preventive detention has at least the merit of novelty. Hitherto the general custom has been to combine the processes of punishment and reformation, and to work them as far as possible simultaneously. Under the new scheme it is proposed to separate these two processes in such a way that the criminal will undergo a preliminary course of correction for his definite offence, and a subsequent course of reformatory treatment for his habitual criminality. The former is to be conducted under the ordinary conditions of penal servitude, and the latter under non-penal conditions, no restrictions being placed on the criminal while he is well conducted further than the limited detention allowed under the Act, coupled with such amount of restraint and discipline as may be necessary for preserving order amongst a criminal class. Recent events at Camp Hill Preventive Detention Prison, where disorderly outbreaks are reported to have occurred, accompanied with some violence on the part of the inmates, point to the necessity of an iron hand in a velvet glove for dealing with these criminals, even under their new and improved conditions of incarceration.

From the point of view of the habitual criminal himself it must be admitted that these unavoidable restrictions are realities which are not exactly non-penalising in character, since every man who walks the earth has in him a spirit of liberty which leads him to loathe detention and tutelage ; but, on the other hand, it must be remembered that every habitual criminal has in his own hands the power of shortening his time in both periods of his sentence.

Such were the well-intentioned provisions of the Act in regard to preventive detention. The written word remains, but administrative procedure has from the outset hampered the free working of the scheme, and very materially narrowed the scope of its application in a way that is detrimental to the true interests of the prisoner as well as to those of the public. The working of the Act affords indeed a good illustration of the innovation in procedure, which has been much too common in recent times, of overriding an Act of Parliament by bureaucratic edict. It is desirable to quote the wording of the Act ;

'10. (1) Where a person is convicted on indictment of a crime, committed after the passing of this Act, and subsequently the offender admits that he is, or is found by the jury to be, an habitual criminal, and the court passes a sentence of penal servitude, the court, if of opinion that by reason of his criminal habits and mode of life it is expedient for the protection of the public that the offender should be kept in detention for a lengthened period of years, may pass a further sentence ordering that on the determination of the sentence of penal servitude he be detained for such period not exceeding ten nor less than five years, as the court may determine, and such detention is hereinafter referred to as preventive detention, and a person on whom such a sentence is passed shall, whilst undergoing both the sentence of penal servitude and the sentence of preventive detention, be deemed for the purposes of the Forfeiture Act, 1870, and for all other purposes, to be a person convicted of felony.

'(2) A person shall not be found to be a habitual criminal unless the jury finds on evidence—

'(*a*) that since attaining the age of sixteen years he has at least three times previously to the conviction of the crime charged in the said indictment been convicted of a crime, whether any such previous conviction was before or after the passing of this Act, and that he is leading persistently a dishonest or criminal life; or

'(*b*) that he has on such a previous conviction been found to be a habitual criminal and sentenced to preventive detention.'

By way of safeguard against a prisoner being charged as being an habitual criminal, it was further provided that such a charge should not be inserted in the indictment without the consent of the Director of Public Prosecutions, that seven days notice of such a charge should be given to the court, and to the prisoner, to whom also the previous convictions and other grounds on which the charge is founded should be notified.

Before the preventive detention period of the sentence could come into force for those who were convicted under the Act, it became necessary for a set of rules to be drafted for the working of the scheme. In laying these draft rules before Parliament in February 1911, the Home Secretary, Mr. Winston Churchill, issued an explanatory memorandum in which he emphasised the fact that preventive detention is a form of imprisonment. He also laid stress on the fact that the Bill was designed for *dangerous professional criminals*, and not for those who were merely 'a nuisance to society.' He pointed out the difficulty of securing uniform action among 180 different police authorities who have to take the initiative in proceeding

against criminals under the Act; and he proposed to issue further instructions to the police to guide them in the selection of cases for presentation. These were to the effect that the police should not, save for special reasons which they must fully state, submit any case to the Public Prosecutor, unless, *in addition to the qualifications expressly required by the Act*, the criminal is (*a*) over thirty years old, (*b*) has already undergone a term of penal servitude, and (*c*) is charged anew with a substantial and serious offence—the test of the latter to be whether the nature of the crime is such as to indicate that the offender is not merely a nuisance but a serious danger to society. The Secretary of State further enjoined on the police authorities the necessity of strict inquiries into the convict's mode of life since his last discharge from prison; and finally trusted that presentations under the Act would proceed on more uniform and restricted lines than hitherto, and would cover more accurately the area of professional crime.

It will be obvious to most people, and more especially to those who are conversant with the exactitude of police requirements in the proving of previous convictions, that these instructions hamper the discretion of the police in the presentation of cases, and that of the Public Prosecutor in the selection of them, while they alter the whole complexion of the Act in regard to the use of preventive detention. If the instructions were designed for the benefit of habitual criminals in any other sense than that of giving them a free run for the exercise of their art, and incidentally for the completion of their criminal education, during the most active period of their lives, they were indeed ill-conceived. If they were designed for the benefit of the public, they are to a large extent nugatory, for a public 'nuisance' unabated becomes in the end a public 'danger' by the same process of evolution as a neglected thief blossoms into a motor-bandit, or a scientific cracksman, or some other variety of accomplished and dangerous criminal.

Under the Act an habitual criminal was a person who had, since attaining the age of sixteen years, been convicted at least three times previously of a crime, and who was persistently leading a dishonest or criminal life. Under the new rules an habitual criminal is defined as a person over thirty years of age, who has already undergone a previous sentence of penal

servitude, and who is charged anew with a serious offence which indicates that he is not merely a nuisance but a serious danger to society. The wide difference that is apparent in these two definitions of an habitual criminal is a measure of the change that has been silently effected in the law by administrative order.

It has been shown above that Part I. of the Act already makes effective provision for budding habituals between the ages of 16 and 21; but, the age standard of habituality for preventive detention having been raised to thirty years, it is obvious that a wide gap in the net is now left for criminals between 21 and 30; and yet this age period is specially productive of crime. In their annual report for 1912 the Prison Commissioners state that this particular age period, although at present showing some slight signs of improvement, 'has in past years been fruitful of conviction and has shown 'no tendency to decrease.' Taking the convictions of males as they stood then, we find that the age period 21 to 30 accounted for 26·4 per cent. of the whole number, and was second only in criminality to the period 30 to 40 which accounted for 29·1 per cent. of the whole number. The similar percentages for the other age periods were as follows: 20·5 for ages 40 to 50, 9·2 for ages 50 to 60, and 8·2 for ages 60 and over. The age period under 21 contributed 6·6 per cent. only of the total convictions as compared with 14·9 in 1898–9—a striking indication of improvement in juvenile crime which must, in part at all events, be attributed to the Borstal system.

In the more recent report of the Prison Commissioners for 1912–3 there is an interesting analysis of the ages on conviction of all the prisoners who were undergoing penal servitude in convict prisons on the 31st of March 1913. This analysis points to a similar conclusion in regard to the number of criminals of a recidivist type to be found in the age period 21 to 30. Of the total number of male convicts in custody on that date, viz. 2681, no fewer than 874 were between the ages of 21 and 30 on conviction; and they formed the largest group, those between 30 and 40, numbering 864, coming next. Apart, however, from their mere numbers, they are a formidable contingent, in all the pride and glory of their adopted profession.

Regarded as candidates for preventive detention, recidivists of the age 21 to 30 are obviously much more hopeful subjects

for reclamation than men of 30 to 40, in whom the crime habit has become so inveterate that it is very difficult, if not impossible, for them to retrace their steps. It follows that the interests of the more promising pupils, many of whom might still be reclaimed, are vainly sacrificed to those of a less deserving and more hardened class of criminals. A case in point was tried at Lewes Assizes in December 1912. A man aged 37, who was reported by the police to have done no honest work for twenty years, was sentenced to a term of penal servitude, to be followed by preventive detention; and the judge expressed a very reasonable doubt whether preventive detention would do him any good. To fill a Camp Hill establishment with pupils of this stamp, with the hope or expectation that many cures will be effected, is to court disaster and disappointment. What really happens is that society is protected for a time, but that is all.

The administration of the Inebriates Acts affords an apposite and interesting object lesson to those who have to apply a new remedy like preventive detention. If none but the worst and most confirmed cases—whether they may be of the drink habit or the crime habit—are committed to the sanatoria intended for the reclamation of each class, good results are next to impossible; and even the most cheery reformer can hardly expect any achievements at all commensurate with his aspirations. A supply of suitable material is in fact absolutely essential for a satisfactory output from these institutions.

When we remember that 87 per cent. of convicts are recidivists, and when we find that out of a total number of 2681 in custody on a given date 444 only had never been in prison before, it is clear that a large proportion of those between the ages of 21 and 30 must have been eligible subjects for a course of preventive and reformative detention. These facts reveal a serious defect in our present course of procedure which must be remedied if full benefit is ever to be obtained either for the public or the prisoner himself from preventive detention.

It may be conceded at once that the establishment at Camp Hill, with its present collection of veterans, is by no means an ideal training ground for younger criminals. The system of association adopted at this prison in deference to the views of certain exponents of prison reform, when seen in actual practice with all its corrupting possibilities exposed to view, is very apt to strike the imagination even of those who denounce separate

confinement in every form and degree. But it is surely not beyond the resources of the prison administration to classify their material, and to segregate the unpromising from the promising pupils. For the rescue of the latter some form of detention, with proper control and suitable discipline, is a crying need. So obvious is this to the Prison Commissioners that they are endeavouring at the present time to extend the age for special treatment on Borstal lines from 21 to 25. Their report for 1913 tells us they have been experimenting with a class of these delinquents, selected from the larger prisons in the north, by segregating them at Lancaster Prison, and subjecting them to a special treatment in which the individual interest of the governor, chaplain, Visiting Committee, and philanthropic helpers is specially enlisted. From a class of even thirty pupils good results have already been obtained, and the late governor ' was able to furnish instances of young professional burglars ' and thieves who, as a result of the individual effort made, ' have now abandoned a criminal career.'

So much for the new age standard set up. Let us now consider the second restriction, which makes a former sentence of penal servitude a necessary preliminary to proving an offender to be ' a habitual criminal ' for the purposes of the Act. The arguments applying to the age restriction are applicable to a large extent *mutatis mutandis* to this qualification also. Criminals who incur a sentence of penal servitude for the first time consist (*a*) of a comparatively few who commit some serious crime which calls for a heavy sentence on its merits, and (*b*) of a comparatively large number who have already undergone many sentences of imprisonment in local prisons before they reach the portals of a convict establishment. The record of the latter and more important group is generally that of persons who have been leading a dishonest or criminal life, and it is the habit, rather than the nature or extent, of their crime that calls for more severe treatment, and for more drastic reformatory measures for turning them from evil courses. Clear proof, to the satisfaction of the court, of the existence of the crime habit (which is in reality the *raison d'être* of preventive detention) ought to settle once for all the right and duty of the State to preventively detain a prisoner, and to make some special effort to alter his vicious mode of life.

For this kind of proof evidence of a previous sentence of penal servitude is by no means necessary. Hundreds of criminals, whom it would be mere affectation to describe as nuisances rather than dangers to society, frequent our local prisons, under sentences varying from three to twenty-four months, for offences against the person, offences against property with violence, malicious injury to property, receiving stolen goods, etc. They are really the stuff of which habitual criminals are made. By the time one of them reaches penal servitude under the present law of England he is no longer a tiro, but a graduate, in crime ; and a term of preventive detention is the best thing that could happen to him. Sociologists tell us that such a person is a product of our social system, and that we are collectively responsible for the anomaly of his existence. Whether this be a truth, a half-truth, or a mere delusive theory as to his origin in the past, we can have no moral justification for denying him in the present such opportunities for recuperation as society offers him under a new system of reformatory treatment. It would appear, therefore, that insistence upon a former sentence of penal servitude as a necessary qualification for Camp Hill is a mischievous provision, since it shuts out many eligibles from the benefits of the scheme, while, from a State point of view, it has the additional defect of filling the preventive detention establishments with intractable and irreclaimable pupils from whom neither credit nor profit can be expected.

The third restriction on procedure—that the accused person must be charged anew with a substantial and serious offence which indicates that he is a serious danger to society—is perhaps of less practical importance than the other two, since the offence actually committed must be sufficiently substantial and serious to entail on him a sentence of three years penal servitude before the charge of habituality can be gone into by the court ; but there is a considerable category of crimes falling short of this definition which become both serious and substantial by mere repetition, and at the same time, when submitted to the danger test, may give rise to legitimate differences of opinion, or to the airing of prejudices, according to the predilections of different presenting authorities. By most criminologists a stealer from the person, convicted for (say) the tenth time, would be regarded as a social danger,

even though his takings on the last occasion were infinitesimal; while other persons, taking a lenient view, might look on him as belonging to the merely 'nuisance' order. Similar instances of a less doubtful degree of danger might be found amongst forgers, coiners, receivers of stolen goods, obtainers of goods by false pretences, and other social pests who are found in profusion in the recidivist class. But the vital objection to this restriction, as well as to the other two, is that it makes light of the *crime habit* which is at the present time the most formidable and disquieting feature of our criminal statistics, and which the legislature expressly set out to remedy, in 1908, by means of the comprehensive provisions of the Prevention of Crime Act.

The Act was intended to cover the whole field of serious crime as practised by habituals, but the cumulative effects of the limitations here described have been to diminish its privileges as well as its penalties. The elimination by procedure of a large section of the more reclaimable class of habituals at once defeated one of the main objects of the Act—that curable victims of the crime habit should be offered a fair opportunity of rehabilitation. It was the success which had been claimed for the indeterminate sentence in America that inspired the motives of those who devised the scheme of preventive detention, and helped to pass the Bill through Parliament. It is true that the necessity for the protection of society afforded another strong argument for the Bill, since the unchecked activities of habitual criminals cried loudly for some more effective measures of restraint. Nevertheless preventive detention is undoubtedly a lineal descendant of the indeterminate sentence; while the reformatory idea, which constitutes the essence of the first part of the Act dealing with youthful criminals, permeates also the second part dealing with their more accomplished seniors. If the Act is to be administered on present lines there is little prospect of improved protection for society, and still less for the reformation of the criminal. Already, since the adoption of the new procedure in presenting cases to the courts, there has been a significant drop in the numbers of preventive detention sentences. For the year ended the 31st of March 1913 the total was only eighty-four males and one female, compared with 121 males and two females in 1911; and

it may be affirmed with certainty that the majority of these habituals were such perfected specimens of their class that very trifling results in the way of reclamation can be expected from their inclusion in the classes at Camp Hill.

Recidivism at the present time is admittedly the plague spot of penology not only in our own country but also in most of the countries of Europe. The problem it presents is one of conflicting interests. Apart from considerations of punishment or retribution, the claims of society for protection interfere with the claims or rights of the individual to freedom. To allow the same criminals to go on inflicting the same wrongs or losses on society, and undergoing the same penalties year after year without any apparent effect on their conduct, cannot be regarded, from a social, moral, or practical point of view, as other than an irrational, as well as a futile, policy.

Increased severity of treatment is out of the question since it has failed before. Public opinion is rightly opposed to a vindictive or indiscriminate use of penal servitude in heroic doses for habituals, and it has wisely insisted on the establishment of special machinery in the Court of Criminal Appeal for checking any such abuse. The tendency of late years, in consequence, to reduce sentences of penal servitude has been very marked, and yet there is no evidence to show that the nature of the crimes committed has been less serious than formerly. The average sentence of men sent to penal servitude in 1899 was 5·02 years. In the present century this average has declined considerably—in 1905 to 4·63, in 1910 to 4·11, and in 1913 to 3·99. If this shortening of penal treatment continues on the same scale for persons who make crime their profession, it is obvious that further measures of restraint or detention will become indispensable, if these men are to be prevented from committing a still greater number of crimes than they commit at present. The State would seem, under these circumstances, to have no alternative other than accepting at the hands of the habitual criminal a large slice of that liberty which he risks so freely for gain, and turning it to the best advantage by inhibiting for the time being his perverse tendencies, while endeavouring to amend his moral character, and to teach him some industry by which he may earn an honest living. Detention and tutelage on these lines are much more likely to correct the habits of an

habitual criminal than any form of punishment that has yet been devised for the purpose.

For certain habituals, who may be said to stand on the doubtful or neutral ground which lies between 'nuisance' and 'danger,' it might be possible and even advantageous to diminish the penal stage of their sentences, and extend to them also the benefits of preventive detention. Many hundreds of men are to be met with in local prisons who could be made, by their labour, to contribute to their own maintenance while working out their own rehabilitation. At the present time they are a source of embarrassment to judges, who do not like to inflict long penal sentences for comparatively slight offences, and yet see the necessity for checking criminal habits.

From the criminal's standpoint preventive detention, as a form of imprisonment which cannot be gainsaid, is *per se* objectionable; but he, of course, runs the risk with his eyes open. The general conditions of life under preventive detention apart from this drawback, though not so rosy as might be inferred from questions in the House of Commons, are by no means insupportable. Any industrious and well-conducted prisoner can earn gratuity and remission of sentence, canteen privileges to supplement a good ordinary diet, the use of newspapers and magazines, smoking, and a parole status which means very slight supervision. These privileges are well calculated to mitigate the disagreeable features of detention, and to awaken the sympathies of any willing pupil.

Already a substantial impression has been made on the numbers of habitual criminals. The Prison Commissioners report that 'figures go to show that the mass of crime is being 'committed by men who are gradually advancing from one age 'category to another leaving a diminished number to take their 'places.' Recruits are being slowly and surely cut off by the operation of the first part of the Prevention of Crime Act, and the ranks of recidivism are gradually being depleted. All that appears to be necessary for accelerating this process is that the two parts of the Act, which were originally intended to be interdependent, should be worked together with zeal and consistency on the lines contemplated in the Act of Parliament rather than on those arbitrarily laid down by Mr. Winston Churchill's administrative order.

R. F. Quinton.

CURRENT LITERATURE.

1. **The Orient Express.** By ARTHUR MOORE. Constable. 1914.
2. **Impressions of British Life and Character.** By MEHERBAN NARAYANRAO BABASAHEB. With an Introduction by Lord GEORGE HAMILTON. Macmillan. 1914.
3. **The English Soul.** By JACQUE VONTADE ('FŒMINA'). Translated by H. T. PORTER. Heinemann. 1914.
4. **The Spirit of Japanese Poetry.** By YONE NOGUCHI. Murray. 1914.
5. **Cubist Poems.** By MAX WEBER. Elkin Mathews. 1914.
6. **The Ragged-Trousered Philanthropists.** By ROBERT TRESSALL. Grant Richards. 1914.
7. **The Life of Walter Bagehot.** By his Sister-in-Law, Mrs. RUSSELL BARRINGTON. Longmans. 1914.
8. **The Works of Maarten Maartens.** Revised Edition. Constable. 1914.

NINE years of wandering have gone to the making of Mr. Arthur Moore's 'Orient Express,' and during those years inclination, no less than duty, made the tragi-comedy of life an affair lived a little closer to the universal exit than lovers of ease might deem comfortable. Yet, it would seem, the draught from Death's door may be refreshing to the really engrossed spectator, may even smell sweet. It certainly makes the show more exciting.

The only feature of his long pilgrimage that seems to have given no gratification to Mr. Moore was the necessity of writing about it. That gratification is his reader's. Mr. Moore was the survivor of the only two Westerners—the other being the young and heroic American schoolmaster, Mr. Baskerville—who took a prominent part in the grotesque siege of Tabriz, when a population of a quarter of a million with an army of 2000 regular troops was reduced to eating grass by a force of Royalists only 6000 strong. The 'strong,' indeed, has a tinge of irony. For out of the whole 8000 there were only 550 combatants that really mattered. And in the last sortie, before sunset persuaded the fatalistic aggressors of the futility of grasping a victory as good as theirs, Mr. Moore's three

hundred and fifty volunteers had dwindled to twenty-seven, Mr. Baskerville's hundred and fifty to nine. Of Mr. Moore's *compagnons d'armes* in Tabriz, one confessed to him that he had been concerned in the Peckham murders, another was chief executioner of the dreaded brotherhood of Dashnakzutiun and had the lives of over two hundred traitors to his personal credit; while Rustum, ablest of bomb makers, was also an admirable expositor of the poetry of Byron and Scott—in Russian. In the transitory 'Millennium' of 1908 in Macedonia ('the cockpit, not of Europe, but of the world') when Turkey for a moment amazingly renewed its youth, Mr. Moore hob-nobbed with patriots of every race whom it would be absurdly inadequate to describe as men of action. In Albania he ventured into the forbidden Mat region, where the price for compounding a man's life in a blood feud is a mere 30*l*. At Bourgayet he enjoyed the lavish hospitality of Jehal Bey, the feudal chieftain of a country unblest or uncursed by taxes, rates, school, or telegraph. This Homeric chief was dressed in a fez, an old frock coat, and elastic-side boots. His was a more impressive exterior, none the less, than that of the two Europeans who escaped out of the hands of General Rahim Khan—Mr. Moore's fervent would-be assassin after Tabriz. These gentlemen were attired only in their goloshes.

To select these few exploits and experiences from a long series is but to suggest the abundant excitement of Mr. Moore's book. Of such a night's living and thinking as on the eve of his execution was the experience of Arshad-ed-Dowleh, Mohammed Ali's commander-in-chief in his ill-fated expedition of July 1912, Mr. Conrad alone could be the subtle historian:

'For two hours he and his captors played the game. He was to have no inkling of his fate till morning came, and pride and caution alike prevented him from asking it. So they treated him as one of themselves. . . . There he lay, half reclining at his ease in the flickering circle of the candles, while behind him in the shadow a standing press of silent Bakhtiari leant upon their rifles, straining rapt faces to catch the talk and seized with all the drama of the night. Often there was a witty word, and sometimes a laugh went softly round the talkers. But . . . the sweat came often to his face while he constantly relit his cigarettes. . . . He told us of the day's fight. . . . It was late when they ended, but he did not wish the sitting to finish. "The talk is good, and why should we sleep yet? . . . Do not leave me alone. . ." '

'The talk is good, and why should we sleep yet? . . .' If that is an episode made to Mr. Conrad's hand, then the story of the ragged and wounded *topje* at Bagh-i-Shah is one after the heart of Mr. Cunninghame Graham. 'Then in the midst of 'the most excruciating pain he raised his head, wrenched both 'my hands down towards him, and covered them with kisses.'

There are politics in plenty and intelligent anticipations in Mr. Moore's 'Orient Express,' unravellings of 'affaires' and lucid expositions of international entanglements. But it is because, unlike so many travellers with a mission, he has neither the merely photographic mind nor is solely a collector of facts, that the effort he disliked was so well worth the making. His Englishness is catholic enough to receive with respect the inimitable Sohrab's naïf inquiry—Sohrab, student of *The Times* and of Monsieur Anatole France:—'Wherein is 'a man happier working at the bottom of a great ship than 'singing on the top of a high camel—whereon one may sit with 'a clean face and see the sun?' And he can deliberately pause on the question—Which is the better possession, a sense of Imperialism or an antique Persian carpet? For Mr. Moore is cursed occasionally with 'a cross-bench mind.' He realises that to share one's personal impressions with the world is to lose something intimate and precious. On the other hand, it is just because what impressions he confides to us are personal, because he has thought and felt as well as observed and noted, that his book is for his reader so memorable, valuable, and vivid an experience.

In 1913 the Chief of Ichalkaranji made a tour of the British Isles. His book, 'Impressions of British Life and 'Character,' to which Lord George Hamilton has written an introduction, is the record of that tour. The chief, a highly-born and cultured Indian Brahman, was already a traveller. He is an authority on a number of questions of general Indian administration, and, in his own State, an administrator of singular efficiency and vigour. He had already translated a book on Economics and a volume of English poems for the people of the Deccan and, after an enthusiastic farewell from his fellow-countrymen, enriched 'with a whole cartload of floral gifts,' he came to Europe with a full, eager, and impartial mind. He returned to India, after

a circuit of these Isles as rapid as it was comprehensive, with certain prejudices solaced and some confirmed. He returned also with lessons—quietly considered and graciously but firmly expressed—for both parties. Many things impressed him—phenomena so diverse, for instance, as the London policemen (before one of whom, on his arrival at Victoria, he paused for some time, ' for a good look '), the beautiful English twilight, our comfortableness, our sense of duty, our systematic charities, Torquay (the one place in all England that stirred a tender nostalgia), a State Ball at Buckingham Palace (' the ' finest scene I have ever witnessed '), Madame Tussaud's (reminiscent of the pageantry of the Delhi Durbar), our massive bullocks and pigs and vegetable marrows, our mechanical milkers, English loyalty—so far from being of a merely passive order or such as would be proffered to the ' kind of hereditary ' president ' one would expect the king of a truly democratic country to be, and last (but not least surprising) our ' almost ' Asiatic polish.' The very variety of this list, from which such universally admired features as the Forth Bridge, the cliffs of Dover, a workhouse and a coal mine have been omitted, reveals the humanity and the open geniality of this urbane observer.

' My readers will kindly excuse me for digressing into a ' sermon,' says the Babasaheb. Such digressions are not less easily excused because the sermons that follow are chiefly intended for his readers in India. But in all things the Chief is candid. He ridicules our stiff collars and our tight boots. Our hobble skirts, in his eyes, are the acme of unbecoming absurdity. In the Woolwich Arsenal he could not but reflect on the horrors of war—war so light-heartedly contemplated for the most part by a nation given over to too much enjoyment and pleasuring. ' Nothing seems to be done on a poor scale in ' Great Britain,' he asserts, hardly preparing us for the irony of what follows :—' even the poverty here is as exclusive and ' acute as the richness and luxury are conspicuous.' He deplores, too, the bias of our newspapers and—far worse because far more insidious—their positive manipulation of news. Speeches at a fête organised by the Unionist Party at Paignton remain in his memory—speeches couched in ' language ' which even an Extremist in India would perhaps hardly dream ' of using.' The audience, however, appeared to be accustomed

to such language. Its forcibility had lost its sting ' and even ' much of its meaning.' Like Mr. Moore's Hadji Vakil el Rooy, the deputy for Hamadan, who in August 1911 even more bitterly shocked and distressed his fellow members of the Persian Mijliss by the assertion that women had souls than by his logic that therefore they should have votes, the Chief believes in and envies the cultivated feminine intelligence that is a mark of English life. His desire, indeed, that his compatriots may attempt to institute clubs after the English pattern is based on the regret that there is ' very little, as it ' is, to attract Indians to their homes.' As for the present ferment of unrest and violence manifest in both countries, his deliberate conclusion is that it is the direct result of the divorce of religion from education.

' Indians are notorious dreamers '—but here is an observer who throughout his heroic round of all the sights kept astonishingly wide-awake. Courtesy, one feels, must have softened many of his conclusions. The Chief came with an open mind. He was already deeply interested in the civilisation of a people who, when the Hindu *Mahabharata* was known throughout India, were little better than savages. He realised that the British Empire ' rests on enterprise, courage, grit, public spirit, ' honesty, and integrity.' But at the same time he cannot but wistfully lament that ' the Aryans never undertook the ' conquest of the world.'

There is a disturbing compliment in the very title of another little volume of discoveries, by ' Jacque Vontade '—a distinguished contributor to the Paris *Figaro* under yet another and more illuminating pseudonym—' Fœmina.' It is called ' The English Soul.' The average Englishman is usually very much concerned about his soul, but, like the little girl who had been informed that a Manx cat has ' no tail to speak of,' he is inclined to suppose that that soul is a something that ' mustn't ' be talked about.' As for any serious attempt to probe into the *national* soul, it is an almost alarming breach of confidence. ' Why should I rush in ? ' smiles ' Fœmina.' ' I admire ' England . . . I love her.' She talked to her dolls in English. The first book she remembers to have read was an English book. And it must be this early insight that has largely enabled her to explore from attic to cellar ' the closed house '

that is every Englishman's mind. Locked forbidding chamber, twilight-haunted corridor, Bluebeard cupboard cram-full of skeletons, she has dared to peep in on them all, and her book is a constant and uncircumventible sequence of surprises. We might have expected the juiciest of thistles, and lo, a strange, elusive diet of (rather thorny) roses. We should have been unsurprised at pearls, but this delicate goldsmith work! It is all a delightful paradox, but a paradox that never stuns or confuses; a paradox, too, that, unlike the variety we are most accustomed to, is intended to illuminate the subject rather than the author.

'It is the virtues of the great and the vices of the small that 'best display the national type.' And the dominant, conspicuous Englishman, the man of action, distrustful of thought, who loves his body with a fervent love, who considers his morning bath as only just next in gravity to his (or somebody else's) family prayers, who steadfastly believes in a somewhat anthropomorphic God, who reverences his appetites as sacred, his sport as sacrosanct, to whom hygiene is a principle of existence, a holiday a moral obligation, and who is a virtuoso in at least one art—that of creature comfort, whose fogs have made him curious and provoked disquiet, whose island home has intensified, if not caused, his extravagant detachment—it is this impassive, inexpressive, self-effacing, typical creature, magnificent in his pride, odd in his snobbery, an original of originals, and (with one crushing reservation) the best-mannered man in the world, who is by turns the mockery and the astonishment, the delight and the despair of Jacque Vontade's 'sparkling, subtle, various,' and infinitely flexible French pen.

This clumsy catalogue is, of course, no true reflex of the delicate original. We may agree, or, at our peril, we may disagree with its conclusions, if thoughts and intentions expressed with so happy and gentle a gravity can be called conclusions. And we may retort that the English Soul is only an abstraction, that a nation is merely the aggregate of so many millions of heterogeneous individuals. But why appeal against a judgment dropping like the gentle dew of heaven upon our heads, and especially since it affirms that many characteristics of the English are such as are generally imputed to our neighbour, and *vice versa*, and that yet this is

a state of affairs for the most part flattering to both nations? The Englishman may wince at the suggestion that in spite of a charitable heart he cannot bear personal contact with pain, sorrow, despair; that he may miraculously recover from the most tragic widowhood, but not so triumphantly from a jilting. Above all, he will demur against the charge of a consistent sensuality. Though for 'Fœmina' a national proverb may be as thistledown, she not only agrees that the Englishman's home is his castle, but also that the way to his heart is still the old, old route. Whereas in France food appeals to the mind, in England it merely appeases an appetite (or, to put it more winningly, the Englishman is never *absent* over his food). Even his vegetarianism is 'neither austere nor moral, but 'boldly physical.' It may even be in part responsible for what, with indomitable John-Bullishness, he patiently persists in calling 'the Militants.' How extravagant this assertion sounds without its penetrating vindication:—The vegetarians 'know the intensity of the pleasure their compatriots derive 'from their hearty food. . . . Their regimen has a character 'of aggression.'

As for that ancient conflict, old as Crecy but more protracted, *l'amour* versus love: it is a fallacy of words. 'We mean by 'love a certain type of emotion; the English mean by it a 'certain degree of intensity, to which any type of emotion can 'attain.' 'They find us immoral. We find them unutterably 'cold and hypocritical.' And yet, 'all the English it has been 'my honour and pleasure to know were exceedingly passionate. 'But they did not show it'—or know it? Reticence—a reticence that maybe borders on cowardice—even in their soul's own solitude, is their saving grace. For 'Fœmina' discovers this all-pervading hidden passion of sensuality in the strangest of places—in Mr. Hardy's landscapes, in Maggie Tulliver, in 'Villette.' 'Poor Miss Bronte! She would have been shocked 'to hear that her books contain almost pathologically correct 'observations. . . .' Possibly, but the 'poor' would have been the less tolerable shock. And then as regards the respective virtues and violences of man's love and woman's, how true it is that Englishwomen fall in love with their little innumerable self-imposed duties to their lovers and husbands as well as with those poor babes themselves. The Englishman respects in woman 'the mystery whence

'limitless passions spring.' It is a little disquieting after this to hear Henry VIII. described as 'perfectly English.' That marital epicure was hardly a conscious devotee of mystery. But 'Fœmina' is Englishwoman enough to appear to contradict herself when necessary with flawless grace and ease. 'On 'reaching England, one contracts the habit of liberty, 'as elsewhere one might contract a fever. The sensation is 'exquisite.' And exquisite is its expression. As Drake shepherded the Armada, she shepherds the English soul.

In 'The Spirit of Japanese Poetry' Mr. Yone Noguchi not only counsels the inspired Georgian to live rather than to write his verses, but he does not hesitate to imply that the English are not a poetical nation. They go to their poetry as a child goes to a lollipop shop, for a momentary comfort and exhilaration. They are not saturated with a poetic tradition. They are rarely creative readers. It is not an exquisite hint, a surcharged echo of thought, of scene and mood, they seek in their poetry, but a lucid, expansive, if not exhaustive, utterance.

It is otherwise in Japan. Ancient Japanese poetry, Mr. Noguchi tells us, is different from Western poetry in the same way as silence is different from a voice, night from day. And why? 'Oh, our Japanese life of dream and silence!' That is the secret. The *hokku*—'tiniest poem of the world'—in the English sense of the word is hardly a poem at all, not much more than a scrap of magically translucent coloured glass is a mosaic. It does not express and amplify poetic thought or feeling; it merely reminds. It whispers out of its cage of seventeen syllables to the attentive ghostly listener what countless generations of the Japanese have spent serene hours of solitude in pondering over, in considering. The reading no less than the writing of such poetry is not only an art—it is an etiquette, a ritual, a séance. Its poets, like the Japanese 'tea-masters,' are 'aestheticists of aestheticists.' In England we boast of our laws and lawns and peers. They take a long time to make exemplary. So, too, Mr. Noguchi's beloved *hokku* is a flowering out of centuries into a moment's content. Its minute loveliness is like a pygmy tree of a thousand years' growth. Of it one asks not shade nor strength nor even endurance, but merely the felicitous idea

of its being. Mr. Noguchi is even a little impatient with his *Uta* poems. Those fourteen extra syllables necessary to this metrical form border on eloquence. The Japanese as a nation, he explains, are 'whimsical, not philosophical; 'emotional, not intellectual.' Our poets hate 'the song of 'wisdom, faith, and liberty. . .' Not ours your Shakespeare, Milton, Wordsworth, Shelley. Truth and beauty, he remarks, with what in our ears implies an almost incredible optimism, want no explanation. The *hokku* is simply an evocation of a truth that is a habit of life, a beauty that is a constant spiritual companionship, a constituent of the very air one breathes. It is therefore 'a bell, helpless, silent, 'when with no reader to co-operate.' Beneath the moon, in the unmoving shadow of the plum blossom, sits the magician amid his rapt circle and, like a tiny lantern, burns the infinitesimal poem, as much theirs that contemplate it as his that enkindled it. But for the alien! Take this masterpiece of a master:

'The old pond!
A frog leapt into—
List, the waters sound!'

and then read Mr. Noguchi's exposition of it. Without such an analysis one might as well present a friend with a desiccated apple pip, assuring him 'Here is Eden.'

Mr. Noguchi deems it 'one of the literary fortunes . . . that 'till recently our Japanese poetry was never annoyed, fatigued, 'tormented by criticism, or troubled by Buddhism or Con-'fucianism.' But though he allows that *hokkus* of grace and distinction may be torn from the context of many English poems, he is a candid critic of English verse. Our poetry is tyrannously governed by 'old history and too respectable 'prosody.' That is a vaguer assertion than that the English poet, 'to speak slangily, writes by the yard.' 'Must you,' he pleads, 'drag in Christianity and Social Reform?' Be poets contemplative, not active. Write, but forbear to publish. Follow poverty. But here, surely, a tinge of irony suffuses good counsel. And just now, when Futurism is Passéist, and Vorticism is raising a vertiginous head, when there are even appearances of the formation of little schools of English verse, even the rest of this excellent advice comes too late.

What would Mr. Noguchi make of Mr. Max Weber's Cubism? —*vers libre*—free indeed at times of grammatical construction, and almost entirely free from punctuation. Apart from Mr. Robert Frost's nakedly simple and concentrated little stories in verse 'North of Boston,' it is the most interesting of the new experiments. Mr. Weber is so far an inheritor of the Japanese tradition that he does endeavour to reproduce in his verse a mood, a continuous state of consciousness with its further and dimmer backgrounds. He explores the magic ordinariness of life. But it is doubtful if the British Public will or even could respond. And more than seventeen times seventeen syllables sometimes enshrine his effort. He is a penetrating psychologist, and in capacity he is a poet. There are beautiful things in his book. But when we compare the effect of this verse with that of fine, lyrical poetry, a difference is apparent. And not only does Mr. Weber's verse differ in effect; for the most part he seems to have only partially succeeded in his actual attempt and intention. He is still seeking his medium. But time will show whether his innovations are justifiable; and all welcome to the bold.

'The Ragged-Trousered Philanthropists' is a forecast. Accepted as what it claims to be, the work of a socialistic house-painter, Robert Tressall, who 'wrote his book and died,' it is a stark, realistic record of life as lived by men and women of moral and physical mediocrity, the slaves of compromise, the prey of a cowardice that is the evil outcome of circumstance. It is as free from any 'passionate' snobbery as it is from the cult of the gentleman. This is not to suggest that the book is unbiassed. The generally accepted meaning of the word 'realism' implies not only bias but distortion. 'The 'air was foul with the smell of beer, spirits, and tobacco smoke.' That 'foul' may seem heaven's own fair to the loafer without a penny to buy awhile its hospitality. It is this very prejudice that is the most striking feature of Robert Tressall's book. His description of the drunken return from a 'beano,' when Rushton, the detested jerry-builder, and his friends had to drive for their lives through the darkness in panic-stricken fear of being run down by the swearing, roaring, galloping brake-load behind them, is a piece of pitiless satire that would hardly disgrace Flaubert. It is when the men on their painting-

decorating job cease work at Crass's whistle and sit down, gallipot in hand, round their pail of tea in the filthy, littered kitchen of 'The Cave' in Mugsborough that their sentiments flower. Owen is the 'eddicated' crank, the butt, the fanatical evangelist (at arid length) of the Public Ownership of Machinery, the National Organisation of Industry, and the rest of a gospel succinctly summed up by his mates as 'bloody rot.' He is an earnest atheist who teaches his little boy agnosticism, and he raises the gorge of the religious in sentiment:

'If Gord,' says Harlow, 'adn't made no cancer germs 'or consumption microbes, there wouldn't be no cancer or 'consumption.'

'That's one of the proofs,' retorts Owen, 'that there *isn't* 'an individual God.'

'You can't tell me a bloody yarn like that,' says Evans; 'there's a Ruler over us, mate, and so you're like to find out.'

'If Gord didn't create the world, 'ow did it come 'ere?' inquires Syme—a young man who has suffered conversion, and has insidious designs on a friend's wife—'I don't pretend 'to 'ave no 'ead knowledge, but 'ead knowledge don't save a 'man's soul: it's 'eart knowledge as does that. I knows in 'my 'eart as my sins is all hunder the Blood. . . .'

As for the parson's trade, it's no work and a . . . sight better pay; and Hell?——

'Hell don't seem feasible to me,' says Philpot (fated to be the desecrated corpse of contention between rival and enterprising undertakers). 'When you're dead you're done for. . . . 'Puttin' all jokes aside . . . There may be some kind of punish-'ment, but I don't believe it's a real fire.'

'Oh, well, you'll find it all out when you comes to die, 'mate,' replies Syme in a threatening tone. 'You'll think 'and talk different then.'

'I believe as *this* world is 'ell,' says Crass with philosophic calm.

So the talk is bandied with a gusto no less racy and far less sycophantic than that of Bottom and Quince and Snug in the suburbs of Athens. Politics, economics, morals—each has its innings; but indifferent life beats on, poverty squats on the threshold, old age is at hand, and evil days ever threaten. There is neither pleasure nor hope in this scamped work for bad pay, for a cheating master and a foreman grieved

'to see anything done properly.' And yet the endurance, the childishness, the self-sacrifice, the secret virtues, the indomitable if sardonic humour of these men, are at least as conspicuous as their fatalism, their want of courage and enterprise, their stupidity. They laugh at their Press, despise their masters, and take a hard life easy. And it is this medley of inconsistencies that fills Owen, the student, the reader, with impotent rage and contempt. He thinks of his child. Is he too to be a slave and a drudge all his life? Such a slavery may be 'Society's crime,' but '*They were the enemy*—'those ragged-trousered philanthropists so many idiot, blinded 'cattle, *they were the real oppressors*, the men who spoke of 'themselves as *the likes of us*!'

This book is only one of many recent attempts to present an apparently insoluble problem. The rot eats deep. The hungry perish for bread, the surfeited perish for appetite. A living wage must imply a *living* earner. The mystic flourishes on a crust, Dives disdains his dish of nightingales' tongues, Lazarus stirs into nightmare out of dream. It is the world-old struggle between consciousness and its environment, and between the seen and the unseen. To confess to the hope that one has the vision and the heart to realise the difficulties, but not the mind to pierce through and beyond them, is to confess in a cold church amid a large congregation. 'But 'what matters after all?' cries Jacque Vontade, no complacent optimist. 'It is England, where the instinct of resistance to 'destruction is stronger than destruction. She has known 'many times of trouble, more tragic uncertainties, more 'fearful struggles; and she is—England.'

Walter Bagehot was of old English stock on both sides, though the excellence of the lump had been leavened by a pinch of French *esprit* in the seventeenth century. The precise difference between bread with, and bread without, yeast is the difference between his prose writings and that of most experts in the drier sciences. It is thirty-seven years since he died. Mrs. Barrington explains that this long delay in publishing his Life is due to family reasons, to the wish to spare those who shared with him the tragic knowledge of his mother's insanity. The consequence is that much essential material is wanting, and there are very few

letters in this volume. None the less, even as it stands, it is a somewhat ponderous memorial of a man of genius greater even than his books, who never wrote 'in the 'air'; whose vividest conviction was that the only chance in literature, as in life, is to be yourself; that you must see before you can make others see; who always took 'a new cut' into things; whose wit was as sharp, without tartness, as his judgment was sound without heaviness, and who was 'as good as 'he was clever.'

Bagehot was a man of astonishing versatility. Religion, political economy, metaphysics, banking, literature—all these were his 'subjects'; in all he was an expert. He was the living intimate of the dead poets he wrote about. He was the treasured adviser of harassed Prime Ministers. To put a 'simple, practicable, intelligible' matter as clearly as ignorance can: when the nation lay floundering in its Floating Debt, and Bagehot was appealed to as the man on the bank, he flung it Treasury Bills, and dragged it safe ashore. Added to this, he enjoyed a never exhausted, an all-interested and eager self. Life was his secret. 'We poor humans,' he said, are 'souls in the disguise of animals,' and souls may be suffocated by intellect. His never was. But he knew the look of a blue devil. His lifelong friend, R. H. Hutton, had to scold him in his youth for a tendency to isolate himself, to slip aside from the world into a mournful solitude. He did not then know Bagehot's secret—'Every trouble in life is a joke compared 'with madness.' Though tempted to be a recluse, Bagehot was not a dreamer. He swept and garnished his mind, but he kept its key in his pocket, and immensely enjoyed that best of all seclusions. It was, as it were, his hobby. He played with his mind as naturally as a kitten plays with its tail. And he was a sportsman. He hated literary froth and pedantic fudge. Vivacity, alertness, a crystal lucidity, a mastered knowledge managed with every appearance of ease —these were his marks as a writer.

But even Bagehot narrowly escaped pedantry—at fifteen. 'My dear mamma, I will now attempt the Life of St. Augustine 'of Hippo. This bulwark of orthodoxy was born at 'Tagaste . . .'; and the attempt is followed by solemn disquisitions on the Corn Laws and Free Trade, to which the affectionate father of this 'greatest treasure' replies in kind.

Letters of rapturous enthusiasm from abroad succeed them, including the confession—'A monk's life is very captivating 'to my imagination, but I do not think I could persuade 'myself into its being right.' Seventeen years afterwards, when Bagehot had given up the law, mastered the art of book-keeping by double entry, fallen captive to the intellectual fascinations of Clough, written excellent prose and no less execrable verse—'Since dull-eyed Love with idiot haste 'O'er human graves has restless paced'—celibacy was no longer a question of conscience. On the 24th of January 1857 the Political Economist was invited to Claverton Manor. The romantic expectations of its six daughters, though one was destined to become his wife and another his generously diligent biographer, remained unmoved at the prospect. But Bagehot, when after breakfast the next morning their German governess had left the room, turned big dark eyes upon the sisters, and remarked 'Your governess is like an egg.' She was, and they cheered up. And when, during a ride to Orchardleigh, the eldest sister's hair came down, that sight of reckless beauty set a smouldering heart aflame. And in the spring of '58 Bagehot is sitting in the summer-house at The Arches, Clevedon, reading Matthew Arnold to his new-made bride.

'I was sitting in the same summer-house,' writes Mrs. Barrington, 'but a few days ago. It is more than fifty years since I had last seen it . . . Trees have grown tall, creepers planted by my sister have covered in thick masses much of the stonework of the house. As I sat among the ghosts, a whimsical feeling as of a dream haunted the whole thing. It was the place—and yet that past to which it belongs did not feel quite real! . . . How to explain this haunting sense that that past all belongs to dreamland? What happens in the brain that weaves a web across the former self and the self of the present? . . .'

To achieve a collected edition of one's works must be to a writer very much what the celebration of a silver wedding is to just ordinary folk. Maarten Maartens (it was for the sake of his English readers that Mynheer Joost Marius Willem Van der Prooten-Schwartz chose the pseudonym that is now a household word) has not as yet a very long career to look back upon. Not much more than twenty years have passed by since the success of 'The Mystery of a Hansom Cab' persuaded

him to try his hand at a detective story. And ' the laboriously ' gathered volumes ' which he now again ' scatters into space ' number only about a score. All of them were actually written in English, though it may not have been merely a false inference which suggested to readers of ' The Sin of Joost Ave- ' lingh ' that it was the work of a translator. One may just speculate for instance whether any landlady could express herself in such English as this—' And it's very sad and a great ' trouble altogether, not to speak of the damage, with the ' doctor locking the shop door and preventing my selling a ' thing all the evening. It's very hard on me, gentlemen ; it ' is a considerable pecuniary loss.' But it is quite certain that ' You ought to be ashamed of yourself, Mynheer Lorentz, ' though I say it, *who never was*,' is as much a miscolloquialism in one way as ' I can't help listening when people play false ' is in another. And no indigenous English writer would venture on ' the great god Snob.'

These infinitesimal symptoms of unease prove nothing more than the supreme difficulty of Maarten Maartens' achievement. They are as rare in his work as masterly passages of description are common. But though English is Mr. Maartens' beloved foster-tongue, and he is ever at pains to adjust the perspective of his Dutch facts for English eyes, only one of his novels deals exclusively with English life—' Her Memory.' This is a study on the heart of Edward Gray. And if on Tennyson's broad shoulders must fall the burden of the extortionate sensibility of its Sir Anthony, who in the endeavour to console a tragic widowerhood recurrently locks himself in an inner room and paints and paints, we must endure in the spirit in which it is offered the vulgarity of its Lady Mary, the unconvincing romanticism of its Eveline, and the stupid insensitiveness of its Mrs. Fosby. As for such a caustic summary as—' It was Christmastide, cold, beefy, loud- ' coloured '—that is a thrust into British vitals which British vitals could alone sustain.

For the most part the stage, the characters, and the theme of Maarten Maartens' novels are of Dutch extraction. In a note to ' The Greater Glory,' however, he is careful to repudiate the charge that he has ' in a small country ' deliberately attempted ' to tread on anybody's toes.' ' I describe manners and ' morals, not individual men . . . the morals of the entire

'human race,' though for all that, 'the land of my birth is 'the best and happiest spot on the globe.' Toes—universal—assuredly do not escape punishment in this fiction. Maarten Maartens' finest novels are concerned with problems. And it is conflicts of conscience, conflicts which external justice cannot touch, that he delights in expatiating upon. His presentation is often diluted with sentimentality. Joost Avelingh, one feels, even at the acme of his remorse, was something of a hero in his own eyes. And 'God's Fool' leaves us wondering what kind of future Hubert's will prove when Alers has gone to his own place, and Elias has attempted an obviously impracticable self-sacrifice. As a recent critic, Mr. J. D. Beresford, has pointed out, it is because these moral problems 'are based on the theory of the positive and negative 'ethic . . . with its inevitable and appropriate reward and 'punishment,' that Joost's sacrifice of himself—and of his wife and child—leaves us only tepidly impressed.

Maarten Maartens' satire can be as mordant as his sentiment is compassionate. He has his aversions. But first and foremost he believes in a story for the story's sake. His novels rarely convince us that their author has been dominated, whether he will or not, by a consuming idea of life. We are not overwhelmed, as we are overwhelmed in the great Russian novels, by the vehemence and instancy of the phantasmal men and women who have pressed through the door left ajar in their creator's imagination, who have made his heart their own. The more completely a novelist is thus carried away, the more complete will be his final mastery of his reader's consciousness, the more absolutely will his work convince and convict us: Here is life. This is only to say that the renewal of a bygone delight afforded by this edition is accompanied by the reflection that a by no means unpleasing tinge of the old-fashioned has fallen on this admirable work.

WALTER DE LA MARE.

THE ENGLISH UNIVERSITIES AND NATIONAL LIFE.

1. **A History of University Reform.** By A. I. TILLYARD. Cambridge: Heffer. 1913.
2. **Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages.** By Dr. HASTINGS RASHDALL. Clarendon Press. 1895.
3. **Jesus College.** By ARTHUR GRAY. Cambridge: F. E. Robinson. 1902.
4. **Reports for the Year 1911–12 from Universities and University Colleges in Great Britain in receipt of grants.** [Cd. 7008–9.]
5. **Oxford and Cambridge Matriculations, 1544–1906.** By J. A. VENN. Cambridge: Heffer.
6. **Early Collegiate Life.** By JOHN VENN. Cambridge: Heffer. 1913.
7. **The Exchequer in the Twelfth Century.** By Dr. REGINALD L. POOLE. Clarendon Press. 1912.

THE significance of the elder English Universities to-day lies in the independence of State grants and the consequent immunity from State control which they enjoy, and in the power which they possess as unfettered entities to influence the future, as they have largely determined the past, of national culture. It is proposed in the present article to consider this significance, to discuss the various relations, actual and potential, of all the Universities to national life, and so to supplement certain positions as to national education and the future of England recently set up in this Review.*

In considering national education as represented by English elementary, continuation, and secondary schools, it is not easy to be cheerful; for these schools have not secured for their scholars health, untroubled study, or efficiency. The national system cannot check the child labour of school children; it is unable to draw into its voluntary evening continuation schools more than a meagre percentage of the tired children who are sent by the elementary schools into the work-a-day world untrained and too often unhealthy and unhappy; it has failed to secure for its day secondary schools any adequate

* Edinburgh Review, July 1913.

proportion of the youth of the country. We have no efficient education for the masses of the people between the ages of fourteen and seventeen; we have practically no day continuation schools at all, and in the evening continuation schools there are very few teachers other than those who are already overworked in the elementary schools. Not only is there a shortage of trained teachers but, so far as teachers specially trained for secondary continuation work are concerned, there is a void. The social dangers involved in the present defects of our educational system are recognised by all social thinkers, and have been stated not only with emphasis but with alarm by successive parliamentary committees. But statesmen are too closely engaged in the wild gamble of politics to deal with the physical inefficiency, the mental and manual unpreparedness, the growing absence of resource in the six million children for whom they have made the State responsible. Certainly the altars piled with blue books that public officials dedicate to an unheeding public are more likely to suffer from arson than to flame with fire from heaven. Few touches of inspiration in educational matters from responsible ministers have illumined Whitehall since 1870, and the probabilities of illumination do not increase. There is the real hope that the medical inspection of all school children and the provision of sufficient clinics to deal with diagnosed cases will be secured. This is the greatest advance of the last half century. On the other hand, there is danger that some measure of compulsion with regard to attendance at harmful evening schools will be undertaken, and the still greater danger that the shortage in trained teachers may lead to a retrograde measure in the direction of monitorial teaching. But, on the whole, at the moment there is not much to hope for, and not very much to fear from, the Legislature. After eighty years of State intervention in education the problem which the State undertook to solve is not only still unsolved but more complex, more remote from solution.

We cannot, however, stand as we are. The problems of education must receive some solution through existing machinery and existing institutions. The University, unarmed with legal sanction but perhaps not the less effective for the absence of compulsory powers, may succeed where direct State intervention has failed.

Some reference to the history of the English Universities will bring before the reader once more the vastly important part that these corporations have played in the history of English education and culture. From the end of the eleventh century we find stirring in Western Europe a new educational force. We see it in England, France, Italy, moulding the beginnings of the University. The final form of this embryo was indeterminate throughout the eleventh century. The Abbey of Ramsey might well have determined its form in England; the School of Laon, its form in France. But in fact the episcopal control of education, dating at any rate from the age of Charlemagne, determined the form of the University both in France and England. Dr. Hastings Rashdall tells us that 'the control of the chancellor over 'education on the one hand, and on the other, the right of 'the competent teacher to the license, form the basis of the 'French university system.' * What was true in France was true here. We seem to hear of something in the nature of a University at Oxford sooner than at Paris. Dr. Rashdall dates the founding of the University of Paris between 1150 and 1170; certainly about 1170 there was a 'fellowship of the 'elect masters' of Paris. Half a century earlier the School of Paris was a cloister school under William of Champeaux. Abelard brought to it the bold theology of the School of Laon, and out of the school so stimulated emerges the guild of learning.

'The University,' says Dr. Rashdall, 'was originally a scholastic guild, whether of masters or students. These guilds . . . were spontaneous products of that instinct of association which swept like a great wave over the towns of Europe in the course of the twelfth century. . . . The causes of the aggregation of scholars in the two cities of Paris and Bologna during the twelfth century as well as the origin of the great guild movement, which led to their incorporation into universities, must be sought in that mysterious awakening of the human spirit which began in the eleventh century and reached its full development in the twelfth.'

At Oxford we have knowledge of a body of adult scholars at an earlier date than in the case of Paris. Professor T. E. Holland tells us that Thibaut d'Estampes between 1117 and 1121 was 'Magister Oxinfordiae' presiding over sixty to a

* English Historical Review, vol. i. p. 650.

hundred scholars. But the impulse was French and was part of the interesting reaction from Caen and Laon that received the encouragement of Henry Beauclerc, and so profoundly affected the history of English culture. In 1133 Robert Pullein was lecturing at Oxford, and in 1149 Vacarius of Bologna was there, teaching civil law.* The universities were the response to a demand in the body politic for new organs of culture. About 1209 Pope Innocent III. recognised the University of Paris and empowered it to be represented by a proctor at the papal Court. In 1231 King Henry III. addressed a series of official letters to the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and they give us a picture of overflowing but lawless universities. They are centres 'ubi convenit 'multitudo studentium,' though the multitude unhappily includes many criminals and rebel clerks. But these Universities meant, nevertheless, new national life. The students flowed in from across the seas bringing, wrote the King, no little gain and honour to the whole kingdom. He enjoins hospitality in the reception of these foreign students and complains of the absence of tutors. We have in these letters a picture of the rude childhood of University life. Seven centuries ago, when the collegiate system was yet unborn, we see two flourishing universities which, even then, for nearly a century had claimed unofficially for Culture a seat beside the throne of Arms, a voice in the counsels of the State, an influence upon the deliberations of the Church.

What Oxford and Cambridge have meant to England in the long ages that separate us from the days of Henry Beauclerc, it is not possible to estimate and measure in any material fashion. The deepening of human life, the enlargement of national character, the enrichment of English thought, the evolution of philosophy, scholarship, and science, the upbuilding of a literature unsurpassed in history, the creation of an empire that overshadows the records of Rome and of a constitutional system that has been a model to the modern world: all these aspects and activities of humanity owe more to the little country towns that enshrine our ancient Universities than can be measured by recorded history, or weighed in the scales of judgment. The mind of the nation is haunted

* Eng. Hist. Rev., vol. vi. p. 238.

with this immemorial achievement which, like a strain of rare music felt rather than heard, fills our imagination with the pictures of centuries that are past and carries that imagination forward through the mysterious avenues of future years. If the Universities have done so much for us in the past, what can they, not Oxford and Cambridge alone, but they and their children also throughout England and the Dominions beyond the sea, do for the days to come?

In order to be able to estimate in some fashion the future influence of the University on national life, we must endeavour to ascertain the manner of its influence in times past. The medieval University certainly wielded no authoritative sway, created by the legislature, over the schools of England. It, like any other school, was, at any rate nominally, in subjection to the Bishop. But, in fact, the influence of the University was overwhelming. It was a little Republic that dominated national thought, that drew out of the nation ever new supplies of thinking power which it returned a hundredfold; it was a Republic that combined intense independence with intense patriotism, a commonwealth that made itself by sheer intrinsic merit, and with the very minimum of official authority, essential to the life of England and of the world. The decadence of the Universities has always forerun national failure; their progress has meant national triumph.

The medieval University drew its members from, and secured the unswerving loyalty of, all classes of society. When the Archbishop of York in 1267 wrote to the Masters of Art in the University of Cambridge 'We would gladly serve the 'University in which we were brought up,' he struck the exact note that indicates the intangible control exercised by these bodies. From the first, a very large number of their members came from the poorer classes. So sacred indeed was the poor scholar that Acts of Parliament of 1388, 1495, 1503 enabled him to beg in an age when begging had few encouragements, and the begging University scholar still perambulated England in the mid-seventeenth century. Equally there is evidence that from the second half, at any rate, of the thirteenth century sons of the nobility and of the upper classes were in residence.* No doubt those sons who were

* Compare Fox's 'Book of Martyrs,' vol. i. p. 429.

intended for arms received in some lord's castle a chivalric education in arms and sport, heraldry and song, but those destined for holy orders, or for some employment of a peaceful kind—later we see medicine, law, and teaching emerge as such—studied at Oxford and Cambridge.

The growth of hostels for the accommodation of students, hostels which became richly endowed Halls and Colleges, corporations destined to defy the University itself and almost to destroy it, was the most notable feature in the early history of the English Universities. Merton College, Oxford, was founded in 1270. On Christmas Eve 1280 the King assented to the 'proposal of Hugh, Bishop of Ely, to introduce in the 'place of the secular brethren of his Hospital of St. John at Cam-'bridge, scholars, who are to dwell together in the University 'of Cambridge, according to the rule of the scholars at Oxford, 'who are called of Merton.'* In 1284 Hugo de Balsham, Bishop of Ely, removed these scholars to what is now Peterhouse, and thus we see the foundation of the earliest Cambridge College. This was rapidly followed by endowment. We read in a Patent Roll dated June 21, 1290 (p. 371), of a licence for the alienation in mortmain by Ralph, Bishop of Norwich, to the scholars established in Cambridge by Hugh, sometime Bishop of Ely, of a messuage in Cambridge. So the long story of the independent endowment of the Colleges began, and the growth of a new series of corporations in that age of corporations was assured.

While the private donor was busy endowing the College the Crown was equally busy bestowing privileges on the University. The Chancellor of Oxford was given judicial authority in personal actions between students and burgesses (1275, October 30), jurisdiction over the Jews in the City, and criminal jurisdiction among the scholars and masters *inter se*. Scholars were largely relieved from feudal burdens and were protected in this respect by both the Crown and the Law Courts.† It is, however, unnecessary to follow in detail a general policy on the part of the Crown, the Legislature, and the Courts, that gave the Universities an independence and a

* Patent Roll (Rolls ed.), p. 421.

† Patent Rolls 1277, June 27, p. 216; *Redvers* v. *Bardolf*: Year Book, 20 & 21 Edw. I. (1293), pp. 296–8.

freedom from taxation which once had been the envied privilege of the Church. The Reformation strengthened the position of these then ancient corporations. The Act of 1571 that incorporated the Universities opened as follows :

'For the great love and favour that the Queen's most excellent majesty beareth towards her Highness' Universities of Oxford and Cambridge, and for the great zeale and care that the Lords and Commons of this present Parliament have for the maintenance of good and godly literature and the virtuous education of youth within either of the same Universities ; and to the intent that the ancient privileges liberties and franchises of either of the said Universities herebefore granted ratified and confirmed by the Queen's Highness and her most noble progenitors may be had in greater estimation and be of greater force and strength, for the better increase of learning and the further suppressing of vice.'

The extraordinary position achieved by the English Universities at the opening of the seventeenth century has already been dealt with in this Review,* and it is only necessary here to repeat the fact that for the first and only time in the history of English education was to be seen in operation a national system that passed its life blood through the University as its heart. The close inter-relation of the University and the secondary school ; the admirable fashion in which one grade of education fed the next ; the remarkable manner in which the State, limiting its interference to the strengthening of the national system, endeavoured to supplement a free system of education by favouring apprenticeship, by facilitating the use of the Universities by the poorest classes, by securing teachers qualified both morally and intellectually for their work : all this is available though unapplied knowledge. Historians, in so far as they have dealt with the matter at all, have dwelt upon the abuses that led to the displacement of this educational system, have shown us the licensing of teachers as a phase of ecclesiastical tyranny, and have exhibited the Universities at the end of the seventeenth century as hotbeds of depraved politics and grotesque irreligion. But it was not so in the late Elizabethan days, the great age of the Universities : when the University wits devoted scholarship as well as genius to literature, and the University ideal was an atmosphere that invigorated the remotest grammar school in the land.

* Edinburgh Review, July 1913.

Throughout the English Renaissance such an excess of light and life irradiated these twin centres of learning, that not even the devastating effects of the Great Revolution and the Little Restoration were able to kill scholarship or destroy learning, though the grammar schools lay empty on all sides, and a blight of idleness, atheism, and immorality lay heavy for a whole century on both Universities.

The nineteenth century achieved certain broad educational reforms: it recreated parental recognition of the necessity of education for every child; it supplied school buildings; it created a great profession of teachers, male and female, which has now organised itself; it revived the dormant grammar schools throughout the land and supplemented them with secondary schools for girls; it not only revived Oxford and Cambridge but fortified these ancient bodies with an outworks of new and eager Universities and Colleges. If the nineteenth century solved no educational problems, while indeed creating many new ones, it at any rate placed the ways and means of solution in the hands of this generation, and for that fact it deserves endless gratitude.

The story of the revival of the elder Universities and of the creation of their younger helpmates is a fascinating chapter in the history of the New Renaissance. The rapid decay in both elementary and secondary education throughout the country, that followed the Restoration, partly as a result of the Conformity legislation, partly a symptom of the relaxed tension of national life after the continuous strain of a century of unequalled effort in every sphere of activity, involved the degradation of the Universities. Nothing but extraordinary reserves of vigour could have enabled Oxford and Cambridge, in the dark days of the eighteenth century, to have preserved, as they did, the tradition of scholarship and hope and effort for the future—exhibited chiefly in the creation of professorships—amid an ever-dwindling roll of graduates and a hateful atmosphere of political intrigue, immorality, and irreligion. The darkest hour was past by 1750, but there were then few grammar schools to feed and renew the life of these discredited seats of learning. Their fame was indeed solely maintained by the reputation, decade by decade, of this or that distinguished scholar. The names of Porson, Gray, Gibbon, Blackstone, John Scott, and others preserved these great

Universities as hearths of culture. But teaching and examining alike had died out. The colleges had choked University life and had killed the national significance of learning. The colleges indeed regarded themselves as private institutions, and seemed destined to suffer the ignominious fate that overwhelmed the not dissimilar corporations known as the Inns of Chancery.

But with the end of the eighteenth century a new life began to stir in England. Events in France were not unheeded here. The voices of Wesley and his companions had touched their generation in a manner that recalls the days of Wiclif and his successors. The old order had run its course. Not only were thought and literature once more awake, but the sense of social responsibility had been new-born. The sufferings of children in the mills, the ignorance of children through the length and breadth of the kingdom had touched the conscience of the people. The monitorial schools and the Sunday schools spread like flame through the land, and both Universities stirred in their sleep. In 1797 the Mathematical Tripos suddenly became a reality, and before the end of the century Oxford resumed examining for her bachelor degree. In 1807 the Oxford Honours Lists took definite form, and in the year of Waterloo the study of Civil Law was resumed at Cambridge.

The slow movement was hastened, to the serious indignation of John Henry Newman, by an article in this Review that brought Mr. Copleston, destined to be Provost of Oriel and Bishop of Llandaff, to the rescue of the Oxford Colleges. Perhaps the best proof that the dawn had come was his reply to the 'Calumnies of the Edinburgh Review against Oxford.' Copleston knew that Oxford as a national University was indefensible; so he shifted the issue and asserted, with an ease which proves that the Oxford manner was no invention of a Master of Balliol, 'the University of Oxford is not a national 'foundation.' This was the issue that was destined to be fought out on many a stricken field in the seven decades that followed. Meantime both Universities had awakened, and the Colleges threw off their sloth in anticipation of the great struggle for dominance between themselves and the Universities. If it required Playfair, Jeffrey, and Sydney Smith to grapple with Copleston and drag the true Oxford into light, the second attack in this Review, which was conducted with vigour

between 1831 and 1836, brought into the field an even more terrible controversialist, and one capable of fighting the University Colleges with weapons that the University herself had forged. Sir William Hamilton, reputed to be the most learned Aristotelian that Oxford had recently produced—a man, moreover, who had learnt in his Chair of Philosophy at Edinburgh the significance of true University life—smote the collegiate system hip and thigh :

' Oxford is not one public University, but merely a collection of many private schools. The University in fact exists only in semblance, for the behoof of the unauthorised seminaries by which it has been replaced, and which have contrived, under covert of its name, to step into possession of its public privileges.'

The issue was fairly stated. Hamilton demanded reform from without. Reform from within was impossible. The Magistrates of the University had been ' guilty of broken faith ' and of perjury.' It is unnecessary for our present purpose to recount the events and factors in the struggle of Titans that followed ; such as Lord Radnor's Reform Bill, rejected on the motion of Bishop Copleston himself in the teeth of Lords Holland, Melbourne, and Brougham ; the promise given in the House of Commons by Mr. Goulburn that Cambridge would reform herself ; Mark Pattison's reply to Hamilton ; Hamilton's enormous influence on subsequent reformers. But it is worth while to quote a passage in which Newman stated his view with his usual subtlety and skill, for that view is still of immense importance. He wrote :

' I am for both views at once, and think neither of them complete without the other. I admire the Professor, I venerate the College. The Professorial system fulfils the strict idea of a University, and is sufficient for its *being*, but it is not sufficient for its *well-being*. Colleges constitute the *integrity* of a University. . . . Taking a broad view of history, we shall find that Colleges are to be accounted the maintainers of order, and Universities the centres of movement.'

When such a position had been reached, reform was merely a question of machinery. In 1850 Oxford and Cambridge were not five decades but five centuries away from 1865. Oxford was about to open her motherly arms to poor students, and Cambridge was not less maternal. However much the Royal Commission of 1850 was objected to by Keble and others,

however rude the dons of a dead epoch were to the Commissioners, the fact remained that the Universities had become national once more, as was indeed proved by the burning interest aroused in Parliament by the possibility of reform. Gladstone himself framed the Bill that followed the Report of the Commission, and adopted from the Cambridge Report the idea of an Executive Commission with statutory powers. If the University refused to act, the Commissioners could do so. Tests for degrees were abolished, but Nonconformists were still excluded from any part in University Government.

The Acts of 1854 and 1856 brought new life into the Universities. They 'started the Universities,' says Mr. Tillyard in his admirable and exhaustive 'History of University 'Reform,' 'on a new period of prosperity.' The problem of the University and the Colleges was solved much as Newman said that he would have solved it. There remained the question of Tests and of University Finance. The first was almost solved in 1871 when the government of the University was thrown open to Nonconformists; the second in 1877, by an Act which provided machinery for the passing of University Statutes reforming collegiate life. The statutes of 1882, to quote the present Master of Jesus College, Cambridge

'constituted a veritable revolution in the history of Jesus College. Some of these changes—such as the limitation of the emoluments of Fellowships, the abolition of celibacy as the condition of their tenure, the limitation of the period during which unofficial Fellowships were tenable, and the obligation imposed on the College of contributing to the common funds of the University—were features introduced into the Statutes of all Colleges alike.'

Moreover tests now only remain in the case of the Oxford Divinity degrees. Cambridge has yielded up even this last bulwark, and to-day, for the first time in English University history, a Jew from Jerusalem may once more persecute Paul of Tarsus in the market-place of knowledge. Oxford still reserves this privilege for Jews and others who have taken shelter in the ample folds of the national Church. But the second battle of reform has been won and forgotten, and behold men are armed and ready for the third.

What that third battle will be about has been indicated at the opening of this paper. The University principle has been,

after long fighting, well established once more, and to-day the Universities of England are beyond all doubt national institutions. All doors are open, or, at any rate, none are locked. A little pushing in these pushing days, and there opens before the aspirant the spoils of time, the opportunities of culture, the cult of leisure, and the crown of learning. But even if it is so—and it will be desirable to point out directly the financial limitations on this pleasant theory—has the University no other function than that of welcoming the elect into its pleasure house of delightful learning and of supplying a work-a-day world with captains of industry and priests of culture? Has it no duty to the toilers of the field and the labourers of the mill, to the young men and maidens whose lives know nothing of the wide horizons of knowledge and true liberty? First, let us consider the remaining reforms demanded from Oxford and Cambridge; next, turn to the national functions of the younger Universities that are to-day doing such noble work in the north and west and centre of England; and, lastly, consider the relation of all the Universities to the great educational problems of to-day.

Mr. Tillyard for the moment limits University Reform in the case of Oxford and Cambridge to the work of 'primarily 'making the Universities as efficient teaching institutions as 'possible.' He adds:

"This being granted, University Reform may be divided into three branches. It means increasing to a maximum the efficiency of the Universities by (1) bringing them into right relations with the Colleges, and the Colleges into right relations with one another; (2) giving the Universities a proper Constitution, or system of self-government; and (3) bringing the Universities as thus reformed into right relations with the rest of our system of National Education. This country possesses Elementary Schools, Middle Schools, Grammar Schools, Local Universities, National Universities. Its system of education, so far as it possesses one, is built up of these different points. These all should be brought into right relations with one another, and communication between them should be as easy as possible. Then England will possess a properly organised system of education. The problem therefore is one of internal organisation and external adjustment. In this adjustment the interests of the nation must be paramount. The internal organisation must come before the external adjustment.'

Mr. Tillyard's scheme of internal reform for Cambridge includes a permanent salaried Vice-Chancellor, a Council of

the Senate in touch with the Boards of studies, finance, examinations, and organisation, and also having representatives of the new Senate. This Senate would consist of 450 masters 'together with 50 other members co-opted on the 'nomination of such outside educational bodies as shall 'hereafter be determined.' The contributions from the Colleges would be largely increased, the Colleges grouped so that each group would contain about the same wealth and the same number of undergraduates and could compete with each other for the best men on fairly equal terms. There would be an examination before entrance to the University: at present there is none and 23 per cent. of Cambridge men go down without a degree. Great savings, in Mr. Tillyard's belief, can be effected by the creation of a Board of Management and Works to do for the Colleges the business work now done by bursars, stewards, and tutors.

Many of Mr. Tillyard's proposals are likely to excite keen opposition, and for the moment it is wise to turn our attention to the younger English Universities. The north, west and centre of England are now possessed of a series of Universities that offer, not all the advantages of the older Universities, but many of such advantages with in fact many additional advantages supplied at a far lower cost than is or probably ever will be possible at Oxford or Cambridge.

Moreover these Universities are very closely in touch with both the ancient Universities, are inspired with the same ideals of pure culture, and superadd a practical spirit that is already re-acting on the areas that they dominate. The work at Durham University has steadily grown since 1833, and at Newcastle-upon-Tyne a School of Physical Science has developed since 1837 into the important Armstrong College (1871), which supplements science not only with arts but Art. Moreover Durham stands alone among the modern English Universities in possessing a practical school of Astronomy. Manchester, fulfilling a seventeenth century ideal, secured as long ago as 1851, thanks to the munificence of John Owens, a college of a University type which was incorporated in 1871, amalgamated with the great Manchester Royal School of Medicine in 1872, and to-day possesses five independent halls of residence: a fact that shows, as indeed the life of other new Universities shows,

that the growth of the collegiate system was no mere accident in the older Universities, but represents something inherent in our national life. In 1880 the Victoria University was founded with Owens College as a constituent College. University College, Liverpool, was added to this University in 1884, and the Yorkshire College, Leeds, in 1887. In 1903 Liverpool secured for herself a separate University, and a year later Leeds also became independent; and in 1905 Sheffield obtained a University charter for her College incorporated in 1897. Thus we find a group of independent but closely interrelated Universities that dominates the ideals of the greatest manufacturing area in the whole world. It is not without significance that these Universities have developed important schools of medicine and dentistry, important training colleges for teachers; are granting degrees in commerce and technology, certificates in factory hygiene, in public health, and in that important subject, social work, involving a knowledge of economics, public institutions and practical work among the industrial classes. These four Universities are bound together by a Matriculation Board, which holds a common examination for entrance into this northern University life, and inspects and examines schools in the great University quadrilateral.

South of this area the hopes of culture are fostered by the University of Birmingham, which sprang in 1900 ready armed from the old Mason Scientific College, incorporated as a University College in 1897. The wide curriculum of this University is unhappily limited by the exclusion of law (other than commercial and industrial law). The University of Birmingham inspects secondary schools and grants certificates which are both school leaving and matriculation certificates. It is related through its widely representative governing body with the chief Universities, including, of course, that of Bristol. The latter University was incorporated in 1909 and springs from the University College of Bristol, which was incorporated in 1876 and absorbed the Medical School in 1893. Bristol University has a great Technical School, or College, supported by the famous Society of Merchant Venturers. The Governing body represents (as is the case with the other great modern Universities) through various public and semi-public bodies the interests, spiritual, commercial and economic, of the rich area of which Bristol is the

centre. Lastly, we must note the University of Wales with its Colleges at Aberystwyth (1872), Bangor (1884), and Cardiff (1883). Admirable work is also being done in the Midlands by the Nottingham (1881) and Reading (1860) University Colleges. When we come to the south, omitting the London area, we have only the Hartley (1850) University College at Southampton, a College that has waged a stern fight with adversity, and is now likely to come into its own.

The renaissance has come to England almost without our knowing it, and the future of England is far more definitely in the hands of her Universities than of a Board of Education apparently destined to be superseded in purely educational functions by the manifold and voluntary activities of the great centres of industry and commerce. The business of the inspection of all schools is clearly a University business, and the time cannot be very far distant when the Board of Education will resign into the hands of competent authorities the whole of the purely educational work. The business of a Government Department is essentially administrative, and it is as unwise for it to exercise pedagogic functions as it would be for it to take over any other field of production. The work can be and is being done with efficiency by the Universities of England. The third campaign for University reform must centre round this transference of power long since advocated by Mark Pattison.

There are two important themes that remain for consideration : the relation of the Universities to that great volume of population which is so manifestly out of touch with higher culture ; and the future, from the University point of view, of the greatest city in the world. Neither the old Universities nor the new have forgotten their duty to those who toil and spin with so little outlook on that superb panorama of culture, that kingdom of beauty and progress, which is both so near them and so infinitely far away. On the 21st of June 1858 Oxford, for the first time, was conducting her middle class examinations throughout the country. In May 1866 Mark Pattison, then Rector of Lincoln College, Oxford, and the leader of the movement for University Reform, declared that the multiplication of exhibitions

'can never "extend" the University to a newer and lower class of English society. If this is to be done, the expensiveness

must be attacked in its causes. Instead of subsidising the poor student up to the level of our expenses, we ought to bring down the expenses to the level of the poor. It is idle to say we cannot. We have never tried.'

That problem still lies before Oxford and Cambridge, but it has, in a great measure, been solved at Manchester and elsewhere. But even were it absolutely solved, the University problem is not solved. The University must become a peripatetic body. It must imitate Mohammed and go out to that vast mountain which we call 'the people.' Mark Pattison declared that 'the true solution of the problem of University 'extension is to be found at last not in expedients for 'recruiting more students, but in raising the character and 'reputation of the body of teachers.' This is at least as true in 1914 as it was in 1866: as it was indeed when Abelard and the other great medieval teachers, by the sheer fascination of their personalities, compelled the students to come in. London University, Oxford and Cambridge, and the later Universities have all, in their several ways, in the development of the University Extension Movement, realised the importance of this dictum of the famous Rector of Lincoln College, and in the north and west the scientific and literary sides of the University Extension movement have made a notable impression on a large industrial class.

More recently an eminently practical turn has been given to the Extension Movement. From Aberystwyth missioners go out into South Wales teaching the fundamental principles of agriculture, of dairy work and cheese making (a travelling dairy is a notable feature of this work), poultry breeding, horticulture and bee-keeping, cooking, laundry work, and so forth. Highly skilled teachers and lecturers draw, by natural compulsion, the workers from the farms. Bangor, for the northern counties of Wales, does similar extension work in relation to agriculture and forestry. In 1911–12 there were 41 courses of lectures with an aggregate average attendance of 1524 persons. Sheffield gives courses on coal-mining in Derby. The Armstrong College gives lectures on agriculture and forestry in the four northern counties of England. Leeds provides no less than 650 courses on agriculture, horticulture, farriery, dairy work, and poultry keeping. But these are merely the fringe of the movement. Bangor supplements its

forestry work by tutorial classes for working people. Liverpool has three-year courses of tutorial classes for work people in an area bounded by Barrow-in-Furness, Crewe, and Wrexham, with excellent attendances. Manchester has similar classes in literature, history, and economics. Nottingham, Reading, Cardiff, Southampton, as well as, of course, the other great Universities of the North, are all at work on these lines. The tutorial classes, often in connexion with the Workers' Educational Association, and the travelling libraries that accompany the skilled lecturers, are of enormous significance. But as yet they are in their infancy. The whole movement requires knitting together with some central guiding force. Yet the fact remains that University Extension is no longer a plaything. The entire population will have, before long, opportunities that have been unknown since the Middle Ages. Oxford and Cambridge might do well to throw themselves into this great work and make themselves the organising centres of a vast new development. They would thus add a new national note to their work, and if at the same time they could assume a central position with regard to the inspection of schools, and could take over the work now necessarily done inadequately by local authorities and the Board of Education, they would achieve much for England and the Empire.

We have little space in which to consider the enormous problem of London, and in that connexion we do not propose to deal with the 'University of London,' a University that is imperial rather than local in character. The point that we propose to dwell on at this moment is the fact that there is no University in London which bears to London anything like the same relationship that, let us say, the Victoria University bears to Manchester. If a local University is a necessity for Manchester, it is no less a necessity for London. It may be, of course, that there are those who are prepared to assert that the University of London serves the purpose of a local University. For an answer let us consider the case of South London. In London south of the Thames there were, in 1911, 420,993 families comprising a total population of 1,843,973 persons; and the population is increasing at the rate of 1000 souls a month. The children and young people in South London are a vast multitude. There are of Continuation

School age (12 years to 17) 168,296 boys and girls ; there are of University, or Higher Education, age (17 years to 20) 99,037 young men and young women. Yet there is no University College in the whole of South London. That is what we mean by saying that the University of London is not a local University. Goldsmiths' College at New Cross was, in 1904, on the verge of becoming a University College, but the idea of Day University Courses was abandoned, and the College never became even a School of the University. At present the existing work is in danger. The London County Council has now its own Training Colleges, and the generous grant of the Goldsmiths' Company to New Cross has ceased. Yet this College is magnificently housed, with great playing grounds, and has hostels available for students from a distance. But for the want of an assured £10,000 a year this one hope of South London is apparently to be destroyed. That is not the way of Liverpool, Manchester, Leeds, Sheffield, Birmingham, Bristol. It is the way of London.

The educational history of the Metropolis is a thing to wonder at. Even in the Middle Ages it had not enough schools. When the eighteenth century opened, there were in London a hundred thousand children of school age, and for these eight to ten grammar schools sufficed. Between 1660 and 1730 about fifty elementary schools were opened in London, Westminster, and Southwark. If London had been supplied on the same scale as the rest of England, she would have had 250 elementary schools. In 1715 there were 120 day schools containing about 5000 children. In 1785 the educational and social conditions of London were, according to Mr. Francis Place, terrible. In 1820 Brougham declared that Middlesex ' was, beyond all dispute, the worst educated part of Christen- ' dom.' In 1870 Mr. Forster admitted that the conditions were fearful. In 1875 there were still 124,000 children between three and thirteen years in London not at recognised schools. But by 1901 the problem of school attendance was at last solved. Since then gigantic efforts have been made to supply adequate continuation and secondary schools, though the reformed Evening School Movement must and ought to fail so far as the child-workers are concerned. But there is no living University movement so far as the masses of the population are concerned, and south of the Thames

there is not any attempt by the University of London to touch the problem, except in the examining of secondary schools, the giving of Extension Lectures, mostly attended by the well-to-do, the ineffective provision of facilities for internal degrees at Battersea, Goldsmiths' Southwark, and Woolwich, very rare tutorial classes, and in the offer of external degrees. South London must have its own University. That is one of the problems of the immediate future. The idea of a University of Greenwich touches the imagination, for the name is of world-wide reputation; the place was the home of the kings of England in our greatest ages; it is to-day the central thinking place of the Imperial Navy and possesses the Royal Observatory, the famous naval school, a notable hospital and medical school, and a great adjacent art school and training college (Goldsmiths') for teachers. The London County Council has here an opportunity that Birmingham in like case did not miss.

Apart from London, the Universities are now in a position really to grapple with that problem of continuation schools with which the State has feared to close. It is true that the University solution will be partly a voluntary solution, but perhaps it will be the better for that. If Bangor can carry culture to the heart of the hills, the Universities, old and new, working in close unison with the great manufacturers and the great local authorities ought to be able to carry the larger hope into the heart of the slums.

J. E. G. de Montmorency.

THE RATING OF SITE VALUES

1. **Report of the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation, 1914.** Cd. 7315.
2. **Taxation of Land, etc.** Papers prepared for the Chancellor of the Exchequer. Cd. 4750 and Cd. 4845.
3. **Taxation of Unimproved Value of Land in New Zealand, New South Wales and South Australia, 1906.** Cd. 3191.
4. **Report of Select Committee on Land Values Taxation (Scotland) Bill, 1906.** House of Commons 379.
5. **Report of Royal Commission on Local Taxation, 1901.** Cd. 638.
6. **Report of Select Committee on Town Holdings, 1892.** House of Commons 214.
7. **Local Rating.** By a Body of Surveyors. P. S. King and Co. 1914.
8. **Rating on Land Values.** By H. TRUSTRAM EVE. *Journal of the Farmers' Club.* May 1914.

THE dominant feature of the budget of 1914 is the proposal to make the rating of site values 'an integral 'part of the system of local taxation.'* In order to facilitate the execution of this purpose the local authorities are offered very large additional grants from the National Exchequer, subject to the condition that a distinction shall be made between the value of rateable property due to houses, buildings or other improvements, and the value due to the land alone. As soon as this distinction has been drawn the exchequer grants will be so distributed that relief will be given to the ratepayer solely upon that portion of the rate that is levied upon houses or other improvements. The effect of this device is to give the local authorities a strong pecuniary motive for supporting the Chancellor of the Exchequer's scheme for rating site values. As the budget was originally introduced it proposed to make a temporary grant for the period from December 1st, 1914, to March 31st, 1915. This grant was not to be based on the rating of site values, and its subsequent

* Budget speech, May 4th, 1914.

abandonment in consequence of parliamentary pressure leaves the main feature of the budget unaffected. At the time of writing it is still proposed to bring into operation on October 1st, 1915, a system of grants dependent on the adoption of the separate rating of site values. The period of six months between March 31st and September 30th, 1915, is still to be bridged by a temporary grant.

Whether Mr. Lloyd George himself believes in the system of rating site values is a personal problem that is hardly worth discussing. The scheme has been forced upon him by a group of Radical members of parliament and Radical wirepullers in various constituencies, who are passionately obsessed with the idea that in the taxation of site values is to be found the one and only solution of every social problem. Similar strange but honest fanaticisms are constantly cropping up in the world's history, but they seldom affect to any considerable extent the mass of the population. In the present instance probably nine men out of ten in Great Britain have not the remotest idea what the taxation of site values really means. The power of the little group of enthusiasts who have adopted this doctrine as a quasi-religious creed rests upon the fact that the two great political parties are so nearly balanced that neither can afford to alienate any strongly compacted group of supporters. Consequently the single taxers by threatening to revolt have been able to coerce the Chancellor of the Exchequer into the partial adoption of their creed, and the whole Liberal party is willy-nilly following in their train. But Mr. Lloyd George is a sufficiently shrewd electioneerer to realise that this novel scheme of taxation would never meet with popular approval on its own merits, and therefore he has linked it up with a lavish system of new doles in aid of local finance. That such a bribe should be necessary is itself a proof of the failure of the single taxers to convert the country to their views. If there were any widespread belief that the rating of site values would produce one-tenth of the blessings that the single taxers promise, the local authorities would be so eager for the new system that, instead of asking for additional Exchequer grants, they would gladly even forgo the grants they now receive rather than miss the promised boon.

It is not intended in the following pages to deal in any detail with the intricate legal questions and elaborate statutory

definitions that have already grown up around this problem. Not only are many of these subtleties quite beyond the intellectual grasp of an ordinarily well-educated man, but they are still matters of unsettled controversy between many of the most accomplished specialists, whether lawyers or land surveyors, who have tried to grapple with the subject. Therefore it is here proposed to avoid, as far as possible, all technicalities and to deal only with the broad economic and political considerations involved. An admirable examination of the problem on its technical side will be found in the two unofficial papers noted at the head of this article. The memorandum on Local Rating by a Body of Surveyors shows in detail the uselessness of the present land valuation, and the same point is pressed home with other illustrations by Mr. Trustram Eve, who has an exceptionally comprehensive knowledge of the subject.

The idea of either taxing or rating site values has been before the public for now more than a quarter of a century, and there is no great difficulty in understanding the essential purpose intended. That purpose is to strip the land in imagination of all the improvements wrought in it or on it or under it by the hand of man, and then to tax the owner on the value remaining, or supposed to remain. Though this proposition is intelligible its most enthusiastic supporters must admit that it is strange. For common experience points to the fact that the greater part of the value of the land in any old country is due to the exertions of man. It is man who has cut down the forests and drained the marshes, and with infinite labour created out of these recalcitrant materials rich agricultural land. Cancel man's work so far as the greater part of the agricultural surface of England extends, and there will be little left to tax. Even more obvious is the contrast between the value of a modern city and the value of the bare land on which it stands. If all the houses and sewers and gas-pipes and electric mains and well-metalled roadways were removed from London, the remaining site—good indeed in places, as the Romans discovered, but in large part covered with marsh—would not be worth much as a taxable subject. Therefore at the outset it appears as if the programme of the single taxers consisted in removing practically everything capable of yielding revenue before beginning to impose taxation.

They escape from this difficulty in an ingenious manner. When they talk of stripping the land of all improvements made by the hand of man they do not really mean it. What they mean is that each particular plot, while being valued, is temporarily to be supposed stripped of all the improvements actually upon, in, or under *it*, but the whole of the rest of England is to be supposed to remain *in statu quo*. The valuers will then say to the owner :

' Your plot of land has a considerable value because it abuts on an excellent thoroughfare near to the heart of a thriving city ; it is also contiguous to a main sewer and to gas and water mains ; these facts give your land a large social value, quite apart from what you or your predecessors have done in building upon it and in connecting it with road and sewer ; therefore we tax you on this social value and we point out to you what a boon we are conferring upon you by not taxing you upon your own improvements as well.'

Having completed, on this basis, the valuation of one plot, the valuers then go to the next plot and mentally strip it in turn of the house and other improvements upon it, but simultaneously restore to the first plot all the improvements which they had previously imagined to be removed. It is much like the thimble rigger who shifts the pea under a new thimble as fast as his victim guesses where it is. By this method each owner is taxed, not indeed on his own improvements, but on the effect that other people's improvements have on his land ; so that except as regards his own assessment every man's improvements indirectly contribute to the increase of the property subject to taxation. In effect, when the single taxers raise their voices in chorus and chant ' God gave the ' land to the people,' what they are thinking of, if they are Londoners, is a bit of Middlesex connected with the metropolitan main drainage system, served by half a dozen great railways, and conveniently situated with regard to Lombard Street banks and Oxford Street shops. By this method of interpretation, the single taxers hope to reconcile their peculiar theology with the requirements of public finance.

But even this adjustment does not suffice for revenue purposes. For though the value of a piece of bare land is raised very much above what would be its true prairie value by the existence of improvements all round it, yet that

value still remains less than the value of the same piece of land with the improvements actually attached to it. In the centre of a large town the value of the site of a house or shop, suitable in character to its situation, may be as much as a fourth of the value of the whole subject; in the suburbs the proportion is more like a sixth; in a small town an eighth or ninth; and in a village about a twelfth. Even if we put the average for English towns as high as a fifth it will be seen that the demand for a single tax on site values as the basis for local rates would play havoc with local finance. Take the not unusual case of the local rates being at present at or above 8*s.* in the £. That 8*s.* is levied on the total value of land and houses. If it is to be levied on site values alone, and these are only one-fifth of the total, the rate must be multiplied by five. In that event we have the absurdity of a rate of 40*s.* in the £. In other words the rate collectors are instructed to take 40*s.* from a thing certified to be only worth 20*s.* What the proposition really means of course is that the ratepayer would be required to pay away in taxation the whole of the value of the site, and then would have to provide the rest of the rate out of the value of the house or other improvements. It is in fact impossible to raise the whole sum required by local authorities out of site values, even as above defined, for the simple reason that they do not yield enough. The single taxers are thus driven themselves to commit what they denounce as the deadly sin of taxing improvements. From that alleged sin they can never escape, for broadly speaking—such is the nature of the world and of man—it is only human improvements that yield taxable values. If we do not tax improvements in one shape or another, there will be nothing left to tax.

This, in effect, is the conclusion reached by virtually all the authorities who have in turn examined the proposal to rate site values. The question appears to have been first seriously examined in this country in 1890 and 1891 by the Select Committee of the House of Commons on Town Holdings. This Committee heard evidence from several distinguished economists and from many of the most prominent advocates of the taxation or rating of site values. It reported in 1892 emphatically condemning the whole proposal.

The matter was next considered by the Royal Commission

on Local Taxation, which reported in 1901. The majority of the members of this Commission upheld the views of the Town Holdings Committee, and reported that there was no case for any special tax upon land values. But a separate report expressing approval of the principle of taxing site values was issued by the minority of the Commission. The signatories of this minority report were all men of exceptional weight, and the fact that they had expressed approval of the principle of taxing site values was hailed with delight not only by the single tax enthusiasts but also by those Liberals who had been captivated with the idea that a new source of public revenue might be found in this device. As frequently happens, many of the people who expressed their gratification with this report spoke before they had taken the trouble to read it. If they had been more cautious they would have discovered that, though these distinguished authorities expressed approval of the principle of taxing site values, they added so many qualifications that their approval of the principle became worthless for practical purposes.

Nevertheless the delusion still lingers in Liberal brains that this minority report contains a full endorsement of all the theories of the single taxers. This is evidently the case with Mr. Lloyd George. On February 4th, 1914, he made a speech at Glasgow which was generally recognised as the result of a final surrender to the demands of the single taxers, and in the course of this speech he alluded in terms of enthusiastic praise to this minority report as 'one of the most powerful and 'convincing of State papers,' and as containing 'about the 'best exposition' of the subject. It is therefore interesting to see exactly what the authors of this report did say. The very opening sentence of their summary is the statement that: 'Misconception and exaggeration are specially prevalent on 'this subject.' Mr. Lloyd George seems to have missed this.

Even more emphatic is the declaration by the signatories of this report that they feel bound 'to condemn unhesitatingly 'all the schemes which have been put before us in connexion 'with the rating of site values.' Included in this condemnation was a scheme put forward by Mr. Harper, now the head of Mr. Lloyd George's Valuation Department. Upon Mr. Harper's scheme the Commissioners remark that it is 'much 'more difficult to understand' than the other schemes

submitted to them. Having thus swept off the board all the schemes advocated by the specialists on taxing land values, the authors of this minority report propounded a scheme of their own. It is unnecessary, however, here to give the details of this scheme, for nothing has ever been heard of it since, and none of the land taxers would for a moment look at it. The land taxers have equally ignored the conditions which the minority report lays down as essential to the equity of any tax on land values.

Finally, this ' most powerful and convincing of State papers ' —to quote again Mr. Lloyd George's words—concludes with the statement that the adoption of the principle of taxing land values would ' conduce to the removal of some of the ' widely spread misconceptions which seem to prevail, not ' only in political circles but among economic authorities ' and responsible statesmen,' and further that ' it would show ' that there is no large undeveloped source of taxation available ' for local purposes and still less for national purposes.' Possibly it was this concluding paragraph which Mr. Lloyd George had in his mind when he spoke of the report of these distinguished authorities as being ' about the best exposition ' there was of the advantages of taxing land values.

The next stage in the official investigation of schemes for taxing land values was in 1906 when a Select Committee of the House of Commons was appointed to inquire into the Land Values Taxation (Scotland) Bill, which had passed its second reading by a majority of 319 to 61. The chairman of this Committee was Mr. Alexander Ure, who had previously distinguished himself by his almost impassioned advocacy of the principle of taxing land values. Other equally enthusiastic supporters of the same principle made up the majority of the Committee. It is therefore not surprising to learn that the Committee reported in favour of that principle. But at the same time the report emphatically condemned as ' indefensible ' the actual proposals of the Bill which had passed the House of Commons by such a huge majority. That is always the way with the land taxers ; they are all enthusiastic for the principle, but when it comes to considering specific proposals they with common accord declare that these proposals are impracticable.

The next stage in the development of the single tax ideal

was the introduction of Mr. Lloyd George's budget of 1909. The land value duties of that year were put in the very forefront of the Finance Bill, and on them was concentrated nearly the whole of the long political fight that raged round the budget. The object of these taxes, according to the statements of their author, was, first to raise revenue, and, secondly, to secure 'a 'complete valuation on a capital basis of the whole of the 'land in the United Kingdom.'

The first of these objects was dealt with in the EDINBURGH REVIEW for July 1913. It was there shown that whereas Mr. Lloyd George and the Prime Minister and other members of the Cabinet all declared that the land value duties would yield, in the second year of incidence, a net revenue to help to pay for Dreadnoughts and old age pensions, these taxes had, down to March 31st, 1913, resulted in a net loss to the Exchequer. All that is now necessary on this point is to bring the figures up to date.

The three Land Value Duties are the Increment Value Duty, the Reversion Duty, and the Undeveloped Land Duty. These are the only duties with which the Valuation Department is concerned and which it collects. The Mineral Rights Duty is simply an additional income-tax on certain classes of income and is collected by the Income-tax Department.* The operation of the three taxes during the whole period they have been in force is shown in the following table:

THE WORKING OF THE THREE LAND VALUE DUTIES.

	1910–11	1911–12	1912–13	1913–14	1914–15
	£	£	£	£	£
Estimated Yield .	390,000*	300,000	255,000	445,000	415,000
Actual Yield . .	2,735	57,695	162,807	386,000†	
Cost of Collection	1,433,497			745,900	843,614

* Arrears £140,000. † Arrears £200,000.

* A small mistake—on the right side—was made in the EDINBURGH REVIEW for July 1913, by giving the Valuation Department credit for the cost of collecting the Mineral Rights Duty, thus reducing the net loss on that department by about £37,000 a year. But it is now officially admitted that the Valuation Department is only concerned with the three duties.

From this table several facts emerge. First that in no year has the yield of these taxes come up to the estimate, and that the yield for the fourth year is actually less than the estimate for the first year.

The second fact is that whereas the estimated yield for the year 1914–15 shows a decline of £30,000 as compared with the estimate for 1913–14, the estimated cost of collection has gone up by nearly £100,000, so that the financial result of these taxes is becoming progressively worse.

The third fact is that the actual yield up to March 31st last, together with the estimated yield for the current year, amounts to only £1,024,000 as compared with a sum of £3,023,000 for cost of collection, so that in round figures the net loss on five years' working of these taxes will be just £2,000,000. Instead of contributing a single farthing either to Dreadnoughts or old age pensions they will have cost the country in five years almost enough to pay for one Dreadnought.

In palliation of these damning figures responsible ministers still continue to put forward the unfounded statement that part of the increased yield of the death duties must be treated as an offset against the cost of the Valuation Department. This point was fully dealt with in the EDINBURGH REVIEW for July 1913, where it was shown by quotations from Mr. Lloyd George's own speeches that the increased yield of the death duties was due to the work of a small department instituted by him early in 1909 before he had even introduced his budget of that year, and costing, as far as can be ascertained, about £5000 a year. In October of that year Mr. Lloyd George spoke with enthusiasm of the work done by this 'efficient valuation depart-'ment' and said that in one week alone it had added as much as £100,000 to the yield of the death duties. That was six months before the land value duties became law. Nevertheless, as recently as May last two ministers, Mr. Herbert Samuel, the financial expert of the Cabinet, and Mr. Montagu, the Secretary of the Treasury, trotted out the old fiction. The latter, imitating the rhetorical methods of his chief, said in the House of Commons on May 6th, 1914, that the valuation for the land value duties 'had been of inestimable value in increas-'ing the yield from the death duties.' Subsequently he gave precise figures. His statement (see 'Times' May 11, 1914) was as follows :

MR. MONTAGU'S CALCULATION.

	Yield of the Three Land Value Duties	Additional Yield of Death Duties	Total
	£	£	£
Up to March 31, 1914 .	610,000	900,000	1,510,000
For 1914–15 . . .	415,000	325,000	740,000
Total . .	1,025,000	1,225,000	2,250,000

The sum of £1,225,000 in five years, or less than £250,000 a year, hardly seems of 'inestimable value' in a budget rising to over £200,000,000 a year. But let that pass. The important point to note is that, even if it were true that the Valuation Department is responsible for this not very large increase in the death duties, there would still be a loss on the working of that department. For Mr. Montagu puts the total revenue for the five years at £2,250,000, and the figures given above show that the cost incurred during the same period is £3,023,000, leaving a net loss of £773,000. This then is the official defence of the Secretary for the Treasury; that, if the Valuation Department is credited with items of revenue to which it is not entitled, the loss upon five years' working of the land value duties can then be made out to be only £773,000. A more scathing condemnation of Mr. Lloyd George's greatest financial achievement could hardly be framed by his worst political enemy.*

Thus from the revenue point of view these taxes are absolutely indefensible, and to this extent—which is a somewhat important extent—the only attempt ever made in this country to tax land values has completely broken down.

It remains to ask whether the expenditure of public money now in progress for the collection of taxes which yield no revenue can be justified on the ground that the valuation obtained at such enormous cost will be of permanent value to the country. Before attempting to answer that question it is

* Mr. Herbert Samuel's statement differs only by a few thousand pounds from Mr. Montagu's; he makes the net loss £800,000. (House of Commons, May 7, 1914.)

necessary to see exactly what this valuation is. This valuation was primarily designed to meet the requirements of the budget of 1909, and those requirements have continuously influenced the proceedings both of the official valuers and of the owners of property. The main object of the valuation, so far as the greater part of the land of the kingdom is concerned, was to obtain a basis for the Increment Value Duty, and it is certain that the Valuation Department, with laudable anxiety to increase the public revenue and to prove its own efficiency, will always tend to write down the value of property, as on the initial date, in order to have a larger margin for Increment Value Duty at a future date. That this actually has been done to a very considerable extent is notorious. All over the country owners of property and solicitors are complaining that the valuations made by the Land Valuation Department tend to depreciate the value of land and to diminish the security for mortgages. So much is this the case that the valuations made by the Land Valuation Department in the hope of obtaining Increment Value Duty are sometimes very much below the valuations made and accepted for the purpose of paying death duties.

Here for example is a significant illustration of the principle on which the Land Valuation Department works. In May 1911 a certain property was valued for death duties by a professional valuer at £1885; this valuation was accepted by Somerset House and death duty was paid upon it. In February 1912 the local Lloyd Georgian valuer wrote complaining that the value had been put too high and suggested £1580 as the correct figure. The solicitors replied that as death duty had already been paid on the higher figure they could not accept the proposed lower valuation. The answer of the local valuer was that if his figure were accepted 'the Estate duty account 'will be amended to that figure and returned to Somerset 'House, when the authorities will no doubt communicate with 'you.' The clear implication is that, if the owners of the property would accept a lower valuation than that which they had declared to be the true one, they would get a refund of part of the Estate Duty paid. The owners again refused and the local valuer gave way. It would be interesting to know how much money has been lost to the revenue by similar proceedings in other cases

Another instructive example of the methods of this department recently came before the Courts. In this case a piece of property in Plymouth was valued by the land valuers on April 30th, 1909, at £750, although it was within their knowledge that the owners of the property had in 1908 refused an offer of £850, and had in 1910 sold the property for £1000. The plea of the department was that this offer, and this price, only came from persons who had a particular reason for wanting the property, and therefore must be ruled out in a valuation intended to determine the property's market value. In other words, according to the economic theories of the Land Valuation Department, the value of a thing is determined not by the price which persons who really want it are actually willing to pay, but only by the price which some theoretical purchaser, who does not much care whether he gets the property or not, might conceivably be willing to give for it. This case was taken in turn before the Referee, before Mr. Justice Scrutton and before the Court of Appeal, and each tribunal brushed aside the view put forward by the Land Valuation Department and insisted on the common-sense view that the value of a man's property depends on what he can get for it, and this in turn depends on the anxiety of potential buyers to obtain the property. Yet although this case has gone against the Valuation Department, it is undisputed that the department has persistently been valuing property all over the country on a principle which is as unsound in logic as it is now declared to be in law. None of the valuations so made can be safely used for any honest purpose.

The same question of principle, it may be added, was involved with other questions in the Lumsden Case, dealt with in this Review last year. On that case the Government has now given way, and has introduced into the Revenue Bill a clause removing the particular injustice which Mr. Lumsden, backed by the Land Union, brought before the Courts. In spite however of this surrender, the Valuation Department, with the necessary approval of Mr. Lloyd George, persists in fighting the case in the House of Lords at very great cost to the tax-payer. By one of the curious anomalies of the British constitution the presiding judge in the House of Lords, the highest judicial tribunal of the realm, is also a member of a party Cabinet, and thus the remarkable spectacle is witnessed of Lord Haldane sitting

one day as a judge in an important case in which the Cabinet is in effect a party, and the next day taking part at a banquet at the National Liberal Club and joining in compliments to Mr. Lloyd George on his financial achievements. In fairness to Lord Haldane it must be admitted that he is able to change from one role to the other with great success. At the National Liberal Club he said no word that could shake the faith of the Liberal party in Mr. Lloyd George's performances; in the House of Lords he spoke with cynical frankness of the hopelessness of trying to understand the meaning of Mr. Lloyd George's budget of 1909 for which he, as a member of the Cabinet, had been personally responsible. If ever the reform of our constitution is seriously taken in hand, the office of Lord Chancellor should be separated from party entanglements and placed on the same footing as other judgeships, or as the Speakership of the House of Commons. Till that has been done the Lord Chancellor should at least refrain from hearing cases in which the credit of the Cabinet is involved.

But whatever be the judgment of the House of Lords on the extraordinary legal technicalities involved in the Lumsden Case, it has now been agreed by the Chancellor of the Exchequer that the Valuation Department is to be deprived of the power of taxing builders on the profits of their business, and to this extent the existing valuation system must be revised.

Still more far-reaching is the effect of Mr. Justice Scrutton's judgment on what is known as the Norton Malreward Case. This judgment was concerned with agricultural land and dealt with three big questions: First, whether the tenant's interest in manures and cultivations should be included in the value of the land; secondly, whether growing grass and other growing crops should be included in any values, and if so in which; and thirdly, whether farm roads should be included in the site value of a farm. It is somewhat significant of the careless way in which our laws are made and administered that such questions as these should still be undetermined four years after the land value duties had come into full operation, and after over £2,000,000 had already been spent in land valuation. Without going into details, which are of necessity abstruse and complicated, it is sufficient to say that Mr. Justice Scrutton's judgment in effect wipes out the whole of the agricultural valuations hitherto made. This was frankly recognised

by Mr. Lloyd George; instructions were at once given to the valuers that for the future 'valuations of agricultural land 'should not be made on a basis inconsistent with the judge's 'decision'; and clauses were inserted in the Revenue Bill of the present year laying down entirely fresh definitions for the guidance of the valuers.

But even if the valuers had been proceeding on sound principles, many of them are so young and so inexperienced and they have been so pressed for time that their valuations cannot be accepted as a fair basis for rating.* The importance of this consideration is shown in the extraordinary list of some actual valuations given by 'A Body of Surveyors' in the pamphlet above referred to. In this list the first provisional valuations made by the Valuation Department are compared with the values finally fixed. Here are a few examples:

A. Valuations reduced:

No.	2	from	£1,200	to £600
No.	7	,,	32,373	,, 14,349
No.	13	,,	24,280	,, 17,000
No.	53	,,	2,725	,, 782
No.	67	,,	1,470	,, 650

B. Valuations increased:

No.	50	from	£2,950	to £5,850
No.	54	,,	2,648	,, 4,839
No.	78	,,	1,000	,, 5,000
No.	79	,,	900	,, 2,700
No.	87	,,	675	,, 1,350

Yet in face of figures such as these Mr. Lloyd George continues

* A case was quoted at a meeting of the Lancashire Farmers' Association at Preston on June 13th, 1914, which illustrates the methods of the Valuation Department. A field had been divided by a fence running down the middle and the two halves were valued separately. 'The valuation showed that one half of the field was valued at £50 per acre more than the other half, although there was not a blade of grass of difference between them as regarded either their present or their prospective value. One official valued one half, and another official valued the other half, and they had no communication with each other.' (Yorkshire Post, June 15th, 1914.)

to declare that his valuation gives an accurate measure of the value of the land of the kingdom.

The above values, it should be added, are 'total values,' that is to say approximately the supposed selling price of the property as it is in its existing condition, but what the land taxers wish to get at is the site value. In order to ascertain this numerous deductions are necessary, but several of these deductions are only allowed if the owner claims them, and many owners through carelessness or ignorance make no claim; so that identical properties appear in the final record with totally different site values.

Finally, even if the valuations had all been accurate at the time when they were made, they would still be worthless as a present basis for local rating, because they are a record of the supposed values on April 30th, 1909, and therefore each year that goes by makes them less fitted to serve as a measure for the distribution of present and future burdens.

For all these reasons it is impossible to avoid the conclusion that the existing valuation is useless for any purpose whatsoever other than the purpose for which it was originally intended, namely the assessment of certain taxes which have been here shown to involve a steadily increasing loss to the Exchequer. Implicitly this fact is recognised by Mr. Lloyd George, for in order to prepare the way for the proposed new system of rating on land values he provides in his current budget for an additional sum of £80,000 to collect material for the new valuations. This sum may seem but a small addition to the huge total of £844,000 that the Valuation Department is estimated to cost in the current year for its original work. But it must be remembered that when this costly department was in its embryo stage, nothing like the present rate of expenditure upon valuation was contemplated. The sum asked for the first year's expenditure was only £50,000. Seeing that this £50,000 has grown in five years to £844,000, we may roughly estimate what the new £80,000 now asked for will have become five years hence.

It is, however, not only the cost to the tax-payer which is serious; equally, and perhaps even more, serious is the hideous worry which the new valuation will inflict upon every householder and every business man in the kingdom.

The notorious Form IV., which had to be withdrawn, was bad enough, but the number of questions it contained was modest in comparison with the searching interrogatory now proposed. Under the terms of the Revenue Bill of the present year 'the owner and occupier of every separately rateable 'hereditament, and any person receiving or paying rent in 'respect of the hereditament' are required to answer a portentous list of questions under penalty of £50. These questions include the following:

> Description and situation of the property; its extent and boundaries; for what period it is held and on what terms; particulars of all outgoings; particulars of all easements and covenants whether beneficial or restrictive; particulars of any improvements, including buildings, plant and machinery, specifying the nature of the improvement, the date when it was carried out, its cost and the unexhausted value attributable to it.

These appalling questions are to go to 'every owner and 'occupier'; that means to the labourer and the artisan, to the clerk and the factory operative as well as to dukes and ground landlords; they are to go to every farmer and small-holder; to every shopkeeper and every mill owner throughout Great Britain. Imagine a London dock labourer, or even a Lancashire mill hand, told to declare under penalty of £50 the unexhausted value attributable to any improvement that may have been made in past times upon the plot of land which is the site of his home! In addition to these questions, which are to go to everybody, a further list of questions is to be inflicted upon the owners and occupiers of hotels, restaurants and theatres, requiring them to reveal in effect all the details of their business. Similar searching inquiries into profits and working expenses are to be addressed to railway companies, water companies, gas and electricity companies, to dock and harbour authorities. Even the dead are not left in peace, for the same inquiries are to be addressed to the owners and occupiers of cemeteries and graveyards.

As if this were not enough, power is given to the Treasury (that means Mr. Lloyd George) to frame a further list of interrogatories, and the list so framed is to have the force of law unless annulled on an address from either House of Parliament; and even when it has been annulled 'anything 'previously done thereunder' is still to be valid. In other

words, Mr. Lloyd George is to be empowered to ask any person in the kingdom any question that occurs to him, and to insist upon an answer under penalty of a fine of £50. And yet there was a time when England was looked upon as the home of freedom.

If this proposed inquiry—even without any additional interrogatories from Mr. Lloyd George—is to be carried out completely, half the adult population of the country will have to be employed in the new Valuation Department, and the other half will be in prison for failing to answer impossible questions. One is almost tempted to believe that the real purpose of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in asking parliament to sanction this monstrous inquisition is to get rid of his Glasgow tormentors by demonstrating to the country what the rating of site values means in practice.

But the new inquisition is only the beginning of the troubles ahead. The actual working of site value rating would produce a separate series of hardships and fresh forms of injustice. Emphatic warning of these dangers has been given by nearly all the authorities who have been consulted on the subject. The latest verdict against the rating of site values was presented by the Departmental Committee on Local Taxation, over which Sir John Kempe presided. This Committee was nominated by Mr. Lloyd George himself, and some of its members were notoriously selected because of their support of the principle of taxing land values. The Committee reported in the spring of the present year, and by a majority emphatically condemned the proposal to make the rating of site values either the sole or a partial basis for local taxation. The reasons for this verdict are stated in the Report of the Committee with admirable lucidity and conciseness. Yet this majority report, drawn up after a careful investigation by Mr. Lloyd George's own nominees, has been completely ignored by Radical politicians, just as they ignored the verdict of the majority of the Royal Commission on the same issue. It is one of the curious paradoxes of political life that men who are always hunting for the suffrages of a majority of the electors seem to think that the opinion of a majority of picked men acting as judges is of no account. Happily for the land taxers there was a minority as well as a majority report of the Kempe Committee, and the minority approved the principle of rating site values.

It is significant, however, that even the minority, though they were led by Mr. Harper—the same Mr. Harper whose scheme the Royal Commission found so difficult to understand—dismissed as 'impracticable and impolitic any proposal to 'raise the whole amount of local rates by a tax on land values.' Yet this proposal is the very essence of the gospel of the single taxers. The proposal made by Mr. Harper and his fellow-members of the minority of the Kempe Committee was that one-tenth of the sum required to meet the existing local expenditure should be raised by a special rate on site values, leaving the other nine-tenths to be raised as at present; but that any increase on the existing expenditure should be met half by a site values rate and half as at present.

Whether this is the scheme ultimately contemplated by Mr. Lloyd George is not yet publicly known. All that is revealed by his budget speech and by the Finance and Revenue Bills is a determination to discriminate between the value of the bare land and the value of the buildings and improvements upon the land, and to distribute Exchequer grants in such a way that the ratepayer will only benefit so far as the rate upon improvements is concerned. To take his own illustration, if there are three properties each with a rateable value of £50, and if the Government grant is equivalent to a rate of 1s. in the £ on all improvements; then if the first property is made up of improvements worth £40 a year and a site worth £10 a year, that ratepayer will receive £2 off his rates; if on the second property the improvements and the site are both worth £25, the second ratepayer will receive 25s.; and in the third case, where the whole £50 is assumed to be due to the site alone, there will be no relief at all to the ratepayer.

It will be observed that this scheme, unlike every other scheme hitherto proposed for taxing or rating site values, contemplates a rate upon annual instead of capital values. This consideration alone, apart from the considerations dealt with above, would suffice to render absolutely useless the existing valuations recorded by the Land Valuation Department. For those valuations are all on the basis of capital value; and necessarily so because they are required for the purpose of a capital tax. This point was made perfectly clear by Mr. Lloyd George himself in his budget speech in 1909, when he stated that it was necessary to provide machinery for a complete

valuation on a capital basis because ' the existing land valuation ' lists on an annual value basis . . . would be of little use for ' the purpose of determining capital values.' But if a valuation based on annual values is useless for determining capital values, equally a capital valuation is useless for determining annual values. It is in fact impossible by any method of calculation equitably to pass from one to the other, because the ratio between capital values and annual values varies with the character of the property, and a revaluation is therefore necessary. That is the final reason why £80,000 is taken in the budget to start a new valuation. The pretence that the existing valuation will help the new one is merely put forward as an excuse for employing Mr. Harper's ' great government ' department ' to do the new job, instead of leaving it to be done by local assessment committees. Something had to be provided for Mr. Harper and his five thousand subordinates as a precautionary measure against the day—possibly now not very remote—when the public will have grown tired of maintaining a department which costs over £2 for every £1 of revenue it collects.

Beyond the personal necessity of providing for Mr. Harper —who was induced to leave a well-paid post on the London County Council in order to throw in his fortunes with Mr. Lloyd George—and beyond the political necessity of placating the land taxers of Glasgow, no reason can be discovered for forcing upon the country a new system of rating which has been again and again condemned as impracticable. Certainly no reason has been adduced either by Mr. Lloyd George or by Mr. Asquith. Apparently, under our present system of parliamentary government, reasons are superfluous when dealing with the House of Commons. It is sufficient for the minister to declare his decision ; the Representatives of the People listen and obey and draw their salaries.

The sole argument used by Mr. Lloyd George to justify the adoption of an entirely new system of rating was the statement that the system ' was working well in British Columbia.' (House of Commons, June 24th, 1914.) The Chancellor of the Exchequer is very badly coached. His advisers ought to have informed him that for some time past the press and public men in Vancouver, the capital of British Columbia, have been discussing whether it may not be necessary to go back to the

system of taxing improvements in order to meet the growth of municipal expenditure.

In September and October last the 'Daily Province' of Vancouver published the views of prominent citizens and members of the City Council on the question of how the growth in local expenditure was to be met, and noted that many persons who had previously been in favour of the exclusive rating of site values had now come round to the view that buildings also must be taxed. Even men who were themselves the owners of large blocks of buildings admitted that it was not fair that the owners of land should bear the entire burden of police and fire protection and of the general upkeep of the city. To quote the words of one Vancouver authority: 'Look at the way the tenants of a high building fill the streets 'with their automobiles, yet their landlord pays the city no 'more than if he had a small structure.'

Writing editorially on this subject, the 'Daily News-'Advertiser' of British Columbia puts very clearly the considerations which render possible a site values tax in a new and rapidly growing town:

'Landowners whose property may be increasing in price twenty to fifty per cent. in a year can easily afford to pay even two per cent. of the market value in taxes. . . . The test comes when values become stationary or when the increase is so small as to give the landowner only a moderate profit. If land is then charged with the whole cost of maintaining city services there will be close questioning both as to the justice and expediency of wholly exempting valuable and profitable buildings and personal property.' (October 2nd, 1913.)—'The exemption of improvements has no special moral or constitutional sanction. Whether city taxes should be wholly or mainly or only proportionately raised from land is a question of equity and expediency. The present system in Vancouver is an experiment. . . . We are now getting our minds clear of the error that the single tax can keep a city in the midst of a perpetual building boom or provide a constant increase of values.' (January 14th, 1914.)

In January of the present year the Mayor of Vancouver in his inaugural address to the City Council reluctantly admitted that it might be necessary to go back to the taxation of buildings and other improvements in the near future.

On March 28th, 1914, the 'Daily Province' of Vancouver published further opinions on this question. The

chairman of the Fire and Police Committee remarked: 'The 'single tax was introduced under the plea that it would benefit 'the working man, but it does the very opposite. It places 'an additional burden upon him and takes it off the business 'block owner.' On April 2nd the same paper in a leading article points out how under the single tax system 'the owner 'of a property which produces $1000 a year income may be 'taxed exactly the same as the owner of the next door property 'which produces $10,000 a year.' On June 8th, 1914, the 'Sun' of Vancouver gave prominence to a long interview with Professor Bullock of Harvard University, who is making a special investigation into systems of local taxation, and declared himself 'opposed to the single tax in any shape or form.'

It is a pity that Mr. Lloyd George's attention was not directed to the movement of opinion in British Columbia before he pinned his land tax faith to the experience of this colony. Apart from the still doubtful experience of a few new countries where the conditions are totally different from those prevailing in England,* there is no evidence in any part of the world of even an attempt to introduce the principles of taxation advocated by the late Henry George. The alleged Prussian examples—as an examination of the official reports clearly shows—are based upon entirely different principles.

The idea that it is possible to produce universal happiness by taxing the bare value of the land is one of those manias, like bimetallism, which sometimes take hold of the minds of otherwise intelligent people. The whole conception of the single taxers is bad *ab initio* because it defies a principle of taxation which we all of us instinctively recognise to be just, namely the principle that the citizens of a country should contribute to the public revenue in proportion to their ability. To tax a poor man at a high rate because he owns land, and to let off a rich man partially or entirely because he owns Consols or gas shares or earns a big income as a barrister, is a proceeding that no argument can reconcile to our fundamental conceptions of equity. It is no answer to denounce private property in land. If private property in land is wrong then the only honest course is to buy out the private owner at a fair valuation.

* According to the New Zealand Official Year Book for 1913, the number of land-owners who pay the State tax on unimproved land values is only 38,232 out of a total of (approximately) 180,000.

To continue to recognise private property in land as valid both in law and in morals, but at the same time surreptitiously to filch it away by exceptional taxation, is a form of dishonesty so contemptibly mean that even a welsher at a race meeting would be half ashamed of it.

The practical objections to the rating of site values are as serious as the moral objections. Under our present rating system some attempt is made to recover from the individual the expense which he imposes upon the community. Thus the owner of a factory requires police and fire protection and good approaches in the way of public roads; and in the same way the inhabitants of a block of flats all require police and fire protection, the daily removal of dust and rubbish, well-kept and well-lighted streets, a good water supply, and drainage system; they require public schools, public libraries and parks and pleasure grounds. It is therefore perfectly just that the persons, whoever they may be, who are interested in the profits of the factory or of the block of flats should pay in proportion to those profits, for the advantages which the community provides. On the other hand, a bare piece of land wants practically none of these public services and is therefore justly exempted from any heavy payment for local rates. Yet the single taxer in effect proposes that all the expensive municipal services required by the inhabitants of Queen Anne's Mansions should be paid for by a tax on the green acres of Holland Park.

The necessary consequence of such a system of rating must be to encourage the destruction of open spaces in towns and the erection of sky scrapers. This is already happening in Vancouver in British Columbia, and a similar tendency is observable in the little towns of New Zealand, where rating on site values has been adopted. Just so far as a tax on site values discourages the 'holding-up' of land—which is one of the main arguments in favour of the tax—to that extent it must encourage the destruction of ancient gardens and other private open spaces in large towns. In the same way, if a property owner is rated solely on the value of the site of his property, he will naturally prefer to build a lofty block of buildings shutting out air and light, rather than a house of moderate size designed to preserve and add to the amenities of the town.

Another grave objection to the proposal to exempt buildings from rates is the impossibility of making good the loss of revenue without inflicting hardships upon a large part of the population. This is most clearly seen in country districts and small towns. At present the occupier of a large house in a rural parish is quite properly asked to contribute to local rates on the basis of the annual value of his house because that gives a rough indication of his ability to pay. If this contribution were reduced the difference would have to be made good by his poorer neighbours. Yet curiously enough the very same people who complain that large country houses are often under-assessed for local rates are also advocates of a complete transference of rates from buildings to site values. This contrast is strikingly brought out in the two reports of Mr. Lloyd George's Land Enquiry Committee. In volume i. pp. 394 to 396, the Committee give currency to, and apparently endorse, statements that large halls and houses are under-assessed because the assessors are afraid of offending wealthy men. In volume ii. p. 560, the same Committee express their belief that the 'complete transference of all rates to sites would un-'doubtedly increase production and promote the best use of 'the land, etc., etc.' Thus, while in volume i. the Committee implicitly condemn the local assessors for not charging the wealthy man enough on account of the big house he occupies, in volume ii. the same Committee contend that the ideal reform is to charge him nothing at all except upon the bare site of his house which has very little more than agricultural value.

As a practical illustration of the working of this system, the following figures are worth quoting. In a small town in Scotland there are two industrial buildings which between them now pay £1600 in local rates or roughly one-tenth of the local revenue. If rating were transferred to sites, the companies which own these buildings would pay at the outside only £360 a year. The difference between £1600 and £360 would have to be made good by the shopkeepers and labourers and market gardeners of the burgh.

In a paper read to the Farmers' Club in 1911 Mr. Trustram Eve, whose more recent paper is above referred to, showed in minute detail how the rating of site values would work out in practice. He took a semi-rural parish of a fairly common type, comprising farm land, market-garden land, numerous

cottages, one or two larger houses, farmhouses and buildings, allotments and gardens without buildings, a brickyard, a smithy, and other oddments, some sporting rights, and finally land occupied by two railways. He carefully valued the whole parish on the principles advocated by the single taxers, and found that in order to raise the existing local revenue it would be necessary to levy a rate of 12½ pence in the £ on capital site values. This rate, it may be noted, would be roughly equivalent to a rate of 20*s.* 10*d.* in the £ on annual values, so that the whole profit assumed to arise annually out of each piece of bare land would be swallowed up by rates. The effect upon different occupiers is striking. The cottagers without gardens, or with very small gardens, would gain a few shillings a year; those with large gardens would lose somewhat more. All the occupiers of land without buildings, namely market gardeners, milkmen, allotment holders, etc., would lose heavily. Farmers would lose on their land and gain on their houses and buildings; but their loss averages nearly fifty times as much as their gain. Practically the whole financial gain of the change to site value rating would accrue to the owners of sporting rights, to the brick company and to the two railway companies. It is for this that our rating system is to be revolutionised.

It may be urged in reply that Mr. Lloyd George does not propose to place all the local rates on site values. That is perfectly true, but so far as any rate is placed upon site values it partakes of the evils above described. In addition Mr. Lloyd George's attempt to combine the single tax with our present rating system would create, as a distinct and separate evil, a complication of local finance which is almost inconceivable.

EDITOR.

THE COMPARATIVE STUDY OF EMPIRE

1. **The Oxford Survey of the British Empire.** Edited by A. J. HERBERTSON and O. J. R. HOWARTH. Clarendon Press. 1914.
2. **The Roman and the British Empires.** By VISCOUNT BRYCE. Oxford University Press. 1914.
3. **Ancient and Modern Imperialism.** By the EARL OF CROMER. John Murray. 1910.
4. **Notes on Politics and History.** By VISCOUNT MORLEY. Macmillan and Co. 1913.
5. **Greater Rome and Greater Britain.** By Sir C. P. LUCAS. Clarendon Press. 1912.
6. **L'Afrique Romaine.** By GASTON BOISSIER. Hachette. 1895.
7. **Studies in Roman Imperialism.** By W. ARNOLD. Manchester University Press. 1906.

THE comparative method has been applied with much assiduity to the study of some phases of history; and the countrymen of Maine, Stubbs, Maitland, Grote, and Freeman may well claim to have taken their share in this process. But there is still abundant scope for its application to the origin, development, and institutions of the British Empire. The subject as a whole has been dealt with inadequately, or altogether neglected, by the masters of historical learning in this country. The industry and literary skill which have illuminated our insular political and religious struggles have been in a very limited degree devoted to the elucidation of our Imperial annals. Until the last few years it was chiefly to American writers that we had to turn for books which belong, in the best sense, either to the literature of power or to the literature of knowledge. We have nothing from an English pen to place beside the American Parkman's prose epic on the struggle of France and Britain for Canada; and if we want to see the history of the old Colonial Empire set forth in the terms of modern historical scholarship it is still to American writers,

like Prof. C. M. Andrews, Dr. Albert Bushnell Hart, and Prof. Gaylord Bourne, that we must go.

The story of British India might well appear a theme to tempt the most accomplished of historians. But it has been left—since the meritorious, if somewhat misdirected, energy of James Mill abandoned it, nearly a century ago—chiefly to the biographers and text-book writers. Some progress has been made of late in exploring the original documents, and publishing the results in such excellent works as those of Sir George Forrest, and in the invaluable volumes of the India Records Series, of which the last * is one of the best. Here are being laid the foundations for a History which may be worthy of the events it is designed to commemorate.

The neglect of the imperial side of our annals by the greater Victorian writers was due, in part at least, to their excessive concentration on the political and legal aspect of English history, and in part to a certain narrowness of outlook. The 'Oxford School,' with all its merits, was curiously limited. Its leaders were so deeply engaged in tracing the growth of English institutions that they lost their sense of proportion. Some of them were obsessed by their devotion to Teutonic and medieval antiquities, and they seem to have thought that nothing was really significant but the evolution of English 'liberty' from the customs and practices of our Saxon ancestors. The history of Greece and Rome, even that of the Continental nations, was deemed valuable, mainly because of the light thrown upon this topic. Freeman in his own time gained a reputation for omnivorous learning, and he had certainly read a large number of books in various languages. But his sympathies were confined within restricted and capricious boundaries. He was always talking about the continuity of history, and of treating the study as a whole; but, in fact, he ignored some of its longest and most fruitful chapters. These writers, good classical scholars as they were, had not learnt that the culture of Hellas and Italy was only one phase of a wider civilisation that had extended through

* 'Vestiges of Old Madras, 1640–1800, traced from the East India Company's Records, preserved at Fort St. George.' By Lt.-Col. Henry Davison Love. Published for the Government of India. 3 vols. 1913.

a remote antiquity, in the Mediterranean, North Africa, and South-Western Asia. Of Oriental learning, in all its forms, ancient and modern, they knew little, nor did the annals of Asiatic peoples seem to them, as even the careful and philosophic Stubbs remarks in one of his essays, to deserve the serious attention of serious investigators. To some of them, ardent Whigs, or Liberals, or Benthamites, suspicious of 'imperialism' and militarism, the expansion of British dominion over Oriental millions or subjugated savages was no congenial theme. It is true that both, Seeley and Froude recognised its attractiveness and appreciated its importance. But their life-tasks lay elsewhere; they only touched the fringes of the subject, and just wrote enough upon it, each in his characteristic way, to make us regret that they did not write more.

Oxford, in our own day, is aware of the British Empire. With its Rhodes scholars and its Beit Foundation, it has no excuse for ignoring it. Prof. Egerton, the Beit Professor of Colonial History, has published some helpful works on the Imperial constitutions, and is training up a band of younger scholars from among whom the great book may come in the fulness of time. The authorities of the Clarendon Press have made a praiseworthy effort to diffuse information by the 'Survey' of the Empire, which Prof. Herbertson and Mr. Howarth have edited. These six volumes are not a contribution to historical research, for the treatment on the historical side is avowedly slight and sketchy. But they include a mass of information geographical, descriptive, political, and statistical, and their chapters are generally accurate, concise, and careful. Something a little more profound and penetrating, a little more authoritative and academic, a little less like an enlarged version of certain indispensable annual books of reference, might perhaps have been expected from so distinguished a source. But the Survey is a useful compendium, and would be more useful still if every section were supplied with an exhaustive bibliographical appendix, like the 'Cambridge Modern History.'

It is, however, not from the active staff of the Universities that the most suggestive of the Empire studies have come of late, but from men who have spent the greater part of their lives in politics or administration. Lord Bryce, Lord Cromer,

Lord Morley, and Sir Charles Lucas have all been concerned, in one way or other, with these tasks—in Parliament, in the Cabinet, at the Foreign Office, the India Office, the Colonial Office, in the diplomatic service, or in the government of great dependencies. They belong to the group of our Elder Statesmen, and they write, it may be added, with that maturity of thought as well as that distinction of style, and with that wide and balanced culture, which we miss too often in the newer generation both of politicians and scholars. We should like to think that the Oxford Honour Schools are turning out first-class men who twenty or thirty years hence will write as well as Lord Morley, Lord Bryce, and Sir Charles Lucas; and that there are young officers of artillery and young civilians who will, like Lord Cromer, find time, in the intervals of arduous public service, for studies at once solid and humane.

All these essays are concerned—though Lord Morley's only indirectly so—with the comparative study of Empire; and three of them with a comparison between the two great examples of imperialism in the ancient and modern worlds—the imperialism of Rome and the imperialism of Britain. We are apt to use this method of comparison far too little in considering the unique association of peoples and countries under the British Crown. That it is unique is true, for nothing exactly resembling it has ever existed before. But there are, and have been, other Empires which may be compared with it in size, in population, in certain racial, administrative, and political features; and these points ought to be noted with more closeness than is usually bestowed upon them.

During a great part of the nineteenth century Englishmen at home could be justly charged with underrating the Empire. They treated the colonies with indifference, the tropical dependencies, even India, with arrogant superiority; they lacked the imagination to see how great their heritage was, and how much greater it might become. During the last twenty or thirty years the opposite tendency has prevailed. Imperialism has been the fashion, and too often it has taken a form which has gone far to justify the cold antagonism it has aroused among those who have not yielded to its glamour. The mere mass of the Empire, its material bigness, its numbers, its extent of territory, have been dwelt upon with an insist-

ence that approaches vulgarity. To some enthusiasts it has seemed unpatriotic to refer to the subject except in inflated terms, and this exaggeration is often no better informed than the old patronising contempt. The facts are seen through a mist of eulogy and self-esteem, which clouds clear vision and magnifies or blurs all the outlines. We talk sometimes as though no other power or people had ever brought great portions of the earth's surface, and many millions of its inhabitants, into its own political orbit. But the world does not belong to us, and others have before now cut out of it as large a segment, and may do so again. On the map the Russian dominion even now fills more space than the British, if we deduct from the former the frozen waste of Kamchatka, and from the latter the Arctic no-man's land of Northern Canada. If we take to counting heads we may not much exceed China; for if a trustworthy census were taken it is possible that the population of that reservoir of humanity might not fall far short of four hundred millions. The actual extent of territory subject to the British Crown has never equalled that which owed allegiance to the 'King of Spain and the Indies,' after the union of the Spanish and Portuguese monarchies. Philip II was, nominally at least, paramount lord not only of Spain and Portugal, and the Low Countries, but of all South America and Central America, including Mexico, with California and Florida, and of huge strips of coast line with military settlements, extending right round Africa, along the Persian Gulf, and up and down the Malabar and Coromandel coasts of India. This was a mighty empire indeed. Of course it was mainly on the map. But then we ought to remember, though we commonly do not, that not a little of our own Empire is also on the map rather than in our effective occupation.

The Spanish Colonial Empire is usually treated by our political and historical writers with high disdain, which indeed is an attitude we sometimes adopt towards the over-sea enterprises of other European nations since the era of discoveries. We are content to believe that most of the Western peoples made some attempts at establishing a dominion in the extra-European continents and island groups; that all except ourselves failed more or less completely; and that we alone have succeeded, and have thereby proved the inherent superiority of the British character, and the incontestable

virtue of British institutions. French, Spanish, Portuguese and Dutch colonisation interests us only as an example of political incompetence, economic error, and personal inefficiency. Towards the Spanish and Portuguese efforts we are particularly supercilious. Spain is our 'shocking example' of what may happen to an imperial state which is denied alike the pure light of the Protestant religion and the blessings of a constitutional monarchy. We may believe that Spain might have done better if it had been favoured with these advantages, and we may admit that its government of the magnificent American domain was in many respects defective. But it is absurd to talk as if there were nothing in all this long and remarkable chapter of history but tyranny, weakness, corruption, and hopeless failure. Even a commentator so open-minded as Sir Charles Lucas can speak of the Latin-American republics as if they had produced nothing but revolutions.

This is to make too much of a transient phase in the history of communities struggling into nationhood. Would it be fair to say of France between 1789 and 1874 that it produced nothing but revolutions? Or of England that it produced nothing but rebellions from 1640 to 1715 or 1745? Argentina is a Latin-American Republic, and it has produced many things besides revolutions. In population, in agricultural development, in commerce, in its transport system, this Spanish State, in a temperate climate, has some claim to challenge comparison with our own self-governing Dominions. Its population is equal to that of Canada, its foreign commerce is larger than that of Australia, it has more miles of railway open than the latter, and nearly as many as the former, and it sends a greater volume of exports to the United Kingdom than either. Its finances are sound, its credit in all the markets of the world is good, its people are apparently contented and prosperous, its government seems reasonably stable. No British Dominion has succeeded in creating a capital so magnificent as Buenos Aires, the greatest city south of the Equator. It is with Vienna or St. Petersburg that one must compare this *Weltstadt* by the Rio Plata, with its palaces, and theatres, and shops, and banks, and newspapers, and warehouses, its wealth, and luxury, and commercial activity, not with Melbourne or Sydney or Toronto or Montreal. And if, as I dare say is the case, it falls below the British standard in

some elements of order and progress, it can hold its own in others. I have seen books on political science and constitutional law, by Argentine jurists and professors, which show that Buenos Aires is not wholly absorbed in making money and spending it.

To treat the Spanish Empire as a negligible quantity, a mere monument of failure and ineffectiveness, is absurd. Spain made many mistakes in the treatment of her colonies, and in the end she lost them : as we lost the best and largest part of our own. But if we take pride in the mighty Union in North America that has sprung from our loins, these Latin peoples have some right to rejoice over the nations they have planted in South America and Central America. Between them they occupy, or at least exercise political control of some kind over, an area four times as large as India. Brazil alone is more extensive than the United States, and it may be capable of supporting a population as numerous. The conglomerate of races in the Americas, dominated by the languages and the social, political, and religious conceptions of the Iberian peninsula, is sixty millions strong, and its numbers are not insignificant even when set beside that other mixed community to the north which represents the ' Anglo-Saxon ' type of civilisation. And we ought to remember that the Spaniards, with all their faults, did succeed to some extent in amalgamating with their subjugated native populations, and impressing their own image—somewhat debased, it is true —upon them. England has never succeeded in doing this, has indeed hardly tried to do it. We have spread ourselves into the outer world either as rulers or as settlers. The new nations we create are fragments of England, transplanted to another soil, and allowed to reach their natural development there. The process is only successful where the natives are so few and weak that they can be almost eliminated, as in the United States and Australia, or reduced to some kind of servitude, as in South Africa. When we are in contact with a numerous population and an organised civilisation, we are merely a governing, a law-giving, a military, or a trading and exploiting oligarchy. In either case we do not assimilate, we do not turn our subjects into Britons by incorporating them with ourselves, nor do we fuse with them, and so produce a new national type, by the combination of the two elements.

In this respect the Spanish Empire is more like the Roman than our own. Every Roman provincial was in the third century admitted to the full rights and privileges of Roman citizenship. But even before that the social and cultural amalgamation had gone far. The educated provincial, born in Spain or Gaul, perhaps of Basque or Belgic parentage, was as much a Roman as if he had first seen the light under the shadow of the Tarpeian Rock. He spoke Latin from infancy, he read the Latin poets, he studied the Roman law and the Græco-Roman philosophy, he made his easy oblations to the gods of the comprehensive Roman Pantheon. Whether he became a fashionable literary man, like the Spaniard Martial, or a soldier, official, or even Emperor, like the Spanish Trajan and the Pannonian Aurelian, it never seems to have occurred to him or anybody else that he was anything but a Roman, complete at all points, *totus teres atque rotundus*. In the Americas it may be that the Spaniards went nearer sinking to the level of their native subjects than raising them to their own. Yet they turned them into Spaniards of a kind, Spanish at least in speech, thought, and racial consciousness, so that we have descendants of the Incas teaching law and literature in Peruvian colleges, and an almost pure-blooded Aztec, who speaks no tongue but Spanish, occupying the uneasy presidential throne of Mexico. This is one way of nation-making. It is not our way; very likely it is not the best way. But it is extremely interesting, and well worth our attentive consideration.

Nor, again, though the political connexion between Spain and her daughter-states has now been sundered, need we regard the Spanish Empire as a merely evanescent episode in modern history. From the first voyage of Columbus to the Treaty of Paris in 1898 there is a period of more than four hundred years, during which Spain held colonial possessions; and even if we take the successful revolt of the Central and South American colonies in 1823 as the virtual extinction of the Spanish Overseas Empire, that Empire lasted longer than the time which has elapsed since the first grant of a charter to the Virginia Company in 1606. We are apt to forget how new the British Empire is, in its existing form. A few years ago there died a venerable nobleman whose father was born before the beginning of the Seven Years' War. Almost

the entire extra-insular dominions of the British Crown had been acquired during the hundred and fifty years or so which separated the birth of the father from the death of the son. Newfoundland, the West Indian islands, a few settlements in West Africa, are the vestiges of the earlier epoch. But all the rest, the great Dominions, the vast Dependencies, India, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, Uganda, East Africa, Nigeria, the Soudan, have come to us in little more than a century and a half. The British Empire is a thing of yesterday, measured by the standard of historic time. That alone is a good reason for examining the Empires which other modern European nations have held and lost. We ought to study the Spanish Empire, to see why it succeeded, so far as it did succeed, and how far, and for what reason, it ultimately failed; not to dismiss it with a few perfunctory generalisations, mostly contemptuous.

Towards the Roman Empire our attitude is more respectful; but here, also, we are too often content with the hasty verdicts of superficial observers. Our classical culture stops too soon. We are drilled in the greater Latin writers at school and college; and as they flourished under the Republic or the first Caesars we know next to nothing of the later Empire. It is the Rome of Livy and Lucretius, of Cicero and Virgil, of Horace and Ovid, that interests us as students of literature and language. But as students of history and affairs it is the Rome of the Antonines, of Constantine, of Julian, the Rome of Ammianus Marcellinus, of Claudian, and Augustine, and Chrysostom, with which we are more nearly concerned. The Imperial power, which kept a good half of the then civilised world in such order as it never knew again for many centuries, has more to teach us than the city-state which overthrew Hannibal and Jugurtha. But the lessons we most commonly deduce are ridiculous in their inadequacy. The Decline of Rome has been a hackneyed phrase since Gibbon made it famous, though the great historian did not himself regard the process as complete for a thousand years after Alaric's Visigoths had sacked the Eternal City. We talk as if Rome had been in a condition of decadence and degeneracy during the whole four hundred and fifty years between the death of Augustus Caesar and the abdication of Romulus Augustulus. The theme lends itself readily to the purposes of the indignant moralist, fortified

by the partial and doubtful testimony of satirists and journalistic historians; and on the evidence of a few passages from Juvenal, or Tacitus, or Suetonius, we are invited to believe that Rome fell because the Roman ladies went to the circus and neglected their babies, or because Roman gentlemen abandoned agriculture for sport and dinner-parties. This is as reasonable as it would be to quote Hamlet's anti-feminist diatribe to Ophelia as a proof of the Anglo-Saxon degeneracy which led to the reverses of the Boer War. We do not turn to the literature of the Lancastrian or the Tudor reigns to elucidate the politics of twentieth-century Europe. But we constantly do something of the sort when we are dealing with Imperial Rome.

The moralists assume that the Empire was misgoverned, disordered, corrupt, and decadent from the time of the first Caesars onwards. There is no warrant for this assumption. The intrigues, conspiracies, and crimes by which the succession of the Imperial throne was secured or altered, left the general organisation of the provinces untouched. The civil service, the military and revenue departments, the provincial administration, went on their course though one Caesar had been stabbed in his bath and another clothed in the purple by a revolt of the palace guards. It would seem that under an autocratic system, when it is combined with a very large amount of local self-government, and a powerful bureaucracy, the political and social apparatus is very little affected by revolutions at the centre of rule. We have an example in China, where Emperors and dynasties rise and fall while the huge, loosely-built, but extremely stable, structure stands unshaken, and almost unchanged, from century to century. To imagine that the hundred millions or more who constituted the Roman world reflected, in perpetual unrest and anxiety, the perturbed politics of the capital, is surely an error. On the contrary they probably lived in more ease, security, and general content, over a longer period of time than any other large aggregation of human beings of whom we have authentic record. We remember Gibbon's declaration that the period in the history of the world when the condition of the human race was most happy and prosperous was that which extended from the death of Domitian to the accession of

Commodus. Lord Morley reminds us that Gibbon's verdict is echoed by a later authority :

'It is nearly a century and a half since Gibbon wrote. The trenchant historian of Rome of our own day and generation, with characteristic daring, puts and answers the same question. "If an angel of the Lord," Mommsen assures us, "were to strike the balance whether the domain ruled by Severus Antoninus was governed with the greater intelligence and the greater humanity then or now, whether civilisation and general prosperity have since then advanced or retrograded, it is very doubtful whether the decision would favour the present." ' . . . 'Evidence enough remains that there was in ancient Rome, as in London or Manchester to-day, "a preponderating mass of those who loved their children and their homes, who were good neighbours and faithful friends, who conscientiously discharged their civil duties." * Even the Eastern Roman Empire, that not many years ago was usually dismissed with sharp contempt, is now recovered to history, and many centuries in its fluctuating phases are shown to have been epochs of an established State, with well-devised laws well administered, with commerce prosperously managed, and social order conveniently worked and maintained.'

There was, of course, another side, or many other sides. Slavery was the 'horrid base' of the whole social fabric, and it produced appalling economic evils, and, no doubt, wide-spread moral degradation and personal oppression. Yet, even so, it may be doubted whether the enslaved labourer in a Roman provincial municipality was in all respects less favourably situated than the 'free' worker, crushed under the iron wheels of modern industrialism, and living in precarious penury in the slums of a modern town.

The Roman system at any rate suited the peoples who were subjected to its sway. It performed for the Mediterranean countries and Western Europe the services we claim to have rendered to India, and it did so far better than they have been done in any quarter of the world until almost our own age. Little more than a hundred years ago the traveller might still have been stopped by footpads near London or captured by Algerine corsairs off Cadiz. There were no pirates on the sea within the Roman world, and no brigands on the land. There

* Hatch, 'Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church,' p. 138.

were good roads, aqueducts, bridges, water supply and sanitation, the best communications possible before steam locomotion was introduced, a first-rate postal service, regular if onerous taxes, equal justice, sound laws and competent judges, entire internal security, and a peace so well guarded that in many of the provinces the soldier, cantoned on the frontiers, was as rarely to be seen as in large tracts of India at the present day.* Such was the *pax Romana*; and we cannot say that such a polity stands condemned, even though it rested on military despotism. 'Rome,' Mr. Arnold tells us, 'had undertaken an impossible 'task, that of ruling an immense Empire without federation 'and without a representative system, where the sole sources of 'power were the supreme central government and the army.' The best comment on this typical criticism is that of Sir Charles Lucas:

'It seems strange to say that the task was impossible, when it was performed so long and so efficiently, and it has yet to be proved in the history of the world that a military despotism in Roman hands was not as long-lived as, or more long-lived than, sounder systems in other hands. But there will always be two opposite points of view from which the Roman Empire can be regarded: one which seeks for the reasons why it declined and fell; the other—surely the wiser one—which tries to discover why this Empire lasted so long.'

It is not a question to be solved in a sentence; and one may read through the volumes of Prof. Ferrero's *Greatness and Decline of Rome* without being quite satisfied as to the answer. Too much, perhaps, is made of the moral decay of the Empire in its later stages, and too little of its military weakness. It does not appear that even in the fifth century there was widespread internal disorganisation. Whatever may have been the remoter reasons for the collapse of the Western Empire, the proximate cause was inability to repel hostile attack from without. The Roman army was not strong enough to protect the Empire against barbarian invasion, and the Roman strategic policy was defective. The 'scientific frontier' drawn after the defeat of Varus was wrongly placed. If it had been carried, as Lord Cromer points out, to the Vistula and the Baltic, Germany would not have been left to be the gathering

* In Italy itself, until the reign of Severus, there was no armed force except the Praetorian Guard, 9000 strong, and the Vigiles, who were the police, night-watch, and fire-brigade of the capital.

ground for the hordes of warlike barbarians who poured across the Danube and the Rhine. The tribesmen would have themselves become Roman citizens and furnished the requisite contingents of Roman Goorkhas and Pathans for the legions. Moreover Rome lost the command of the sea. It held the Mediterranean; but it had no fleets strong enough to quell the Saxons and the Normans and the other Northern rovers, who descended upon the Western provinces, and at length sailed into the inland waters, and raided Sicily and Africa and Italy itself. It is at least as good a moral as any other that a great Empire cannot be maintained without a mighty army and an overpowering navy; and that neither of these can be had without adequate taxable resources. Rome lost its army and its navy from inability to pay for them. 'Finance,' says Lord Bryce, 'was the standing difficulty of the Roman as it is of the 'Anglo-Indian Administrator. Indeed the Roman Empire may 'be said to have perished from want of revenue.'

Arduous as the task of the Roman administrators may have been, it was in several respects much easier than our own. The Roman Empire lay within a great ring-fence with Italy at the centre. From the capital the traveller could journey to the remotest of the Imperial territories, to the Grampians, the Taurus, or the Upper Nile, without passing over a league of soil under an alien jurisdiction, and without any long sea-passage. Each province had a frontier which marched with that of some other province. To the philosophic commentator, like Burke, who knew that a despatch to some parts of India might not be delivered for months, after travelling many thousands of miles by sea, or passing through the dominions of many foreign and perhaps hostile sovereigns, the task of imperial organisation might well have seemed almost hopeless. To Burke a person who thought of colonial representation in the English parliament appeared a foolish idealist. 'It costs him nothing to fight with Nature and to conquer the 'order of Providence.' But we have fought with Nature, as Sir Charles Lucas says, and found that it was not the order of Providence. Science has annihilated distance and brought all parts of the British Empire much closer together than were those of Rome. Yet even modern Science has not been able to produce uniformity of climatic conditions. The Roman

Empire had some tropical or sub-tropical possessions in Upper Egypt and Mesopotamia. Otherwise it lay within the temperate zone, and the great majority of its inhabitants were exposed to similar physical influences, and those were on the whole tolerable to its dominant caste. No doubt, a Roman officer may have found the cold trying at Hexham, or grumbled at the heat of the Nile valley. But in either station, or in any other to which he might be sent, he could live in some comfort, he could have his wife with him, he could make a home for himself, his family, and his descendants. And herein the Italian-born administrator was in a very different position from the Englishman in India or West Africa, official, soldier, or trader, who is in the country but not of it, and cherishes the *animus revertendi* throughout his whole term of residence, be it short or long.

Another and very notable advantage of the ancient rulers was that they had no colour-line. The separate identity of the 'white' races—Mr. Bernard Shaw has pointed out that 'pink' would be a more accurately distinguishing epithet—with its resulting consciousness of difference from the black, the brown, and the yellow peoples, is of comparatively modern growth. There is little trace of it in the classical literatures. The Romans, and even more the Greeks, had an intense racial pride;[3] but it showed itself in a certain contempt for all who were outside their own ethnic group, whatever might be the hue of their skins. They thought no worse of the black, if blameless, Ethiopians, than of the red-haired Gauls and the blue-eyed Britons; all were alike barbarians, and therefore inferior in some degree. No doubt there was in Greece, and in Rome till the later Imperial period, a prejudice against intermarriage with foreigners. But the feeling, so far as it went, was not based on colour or even race, but on the sentiment of social and cultural superiority. Horace considered it a disgrace that the Roman captives, after the defeat of Crassus by the Parthians, married native wives:

> 'Milesne Crassi, conjuge barbara,
> Turpis maritus vixit?'

but Sir William Ramsay thinks he would have regarded it as equally disgraceful if they had settled on the Elbe and married German wives, or on the Thames and married British wives.

Roman society was scandalised over Julius Caesar's amours with African queens ; but Suetonius puts in the same category his connexion with the Moorish, and probably coloured, Eunoe, and with the Graeco-Egyptian Cleopatra who was as white as himself. Propertius, an old-fashioned Tory and nationalist, disliked Cleopatra, not for her race or complexion, but because she corrupted Roman virtue by *foeda conopia*, 'disgraceful 'mosquito-curtains,' and other innovations of an oriental and degenerate kind. There is no indication that antipathy based on colour, considered by itself, formed a bar to social intercourse, and therefore to intermarriage. Marriages, in fact, did take place very freely ; and we know that Roman officers, civil and military, found wives for themselves, not only in the European provinces but also in Syria, Mauretania, and Tripoli.

The contrast in this respect between the ancient and the modern world is striking. Lord Cromer thinks that the colour-line was drawn, or at any rate became distinctly marked, with the introduction of negro slavery. The black man was held to be destined by Providence for servitude, and was stamped from birth with the outward marks of inferiority and subjection ; and the prejudice gradually extended to all persons of colour, so that it was not unusual to hear high-caste Rajputs and Brahmins urbanely described as 'niggers' by the Anglo-Indians of a generation not yet quite extinct. Religion lent its powerful aid to this tendency. The coloured peoples were heathens, and all alike therefore stood on an entirely different footing from even the least civilised Christians. Rome was conscious of neither disability. There was no servile type or servile race, for the slave might be of the same appearance and the same nationality as his master. There was no religious exclusiveness, for the Roman was quite ready to give the gods of any people a place beside his own, and most of his subjects were equally liberal. It was only when he came into touch with stiff-necked Jews and earnest Christians, who mixed politics with their theology, that he became a persecutor.

But the non-existence of a colour-line was due in the main to another cause, which is conspicuously absent in our own case. In the Roman world, 'there was,' says Lord Bryce, 'a similarity of conditions which pointed to, and ultimately 'effected, a fusion of the peoples.' The ruling Italian stock

was happily constituted for this purpose. It had a sufficient admixture of the Celtic and Teutonic elements to mingle freely with its European neighbours ; but it was also Southern enough to be on terms with the peoples who wore 'the shadow'd 'livery of the burnish'd sun.' The ancient Italian, like the Spaniard and Portuguese afterwards, felt the colour difference far less than the men of Northern and Western Europe ; and he seems to have possessed a racial and social adaptability—shared also to some extent by the modern Latin peoples—which Saxons, Scandinavians, and Teutons have lacked. It is not climate alone that renders it difficult for Englishmen, and Scotchmen, and Dutchmen to amalgamate with an alien variety of the human species, even when it is akin to themselves. The history of the Dutch in South Africa and the Eastern Archipelago, of the English not merely in the tropics but in French Canada—and one may say nearer home—bears testimony to this characteristic. The Romans succeeded extremely well, under relatively favourable conditions. What they would have done if their Eastern and Southern subjects had been numbered by hundreds of millions, mostly within the tropics, is another question. They were spared the colour problem in the acute form under which it presents itself in Greater Britain.

They were spared another difficulty which has an intimate bearing on this question of physical and racial differences. A complication like that which has arisen in British Columbia, owing to the refusal of the local government to admit Indian immigrants, could not have occurred in Rome. The Emperor would simply have sent a rescript to the proconsul, reminding him that these visitors were Roman citizens or subjects, and ordering him to make immediate arrangements for their reception. The order would have been obeyed, though no doubt the Pontius Pilate of British Columbia would have paid as much deference as the circumstances permitted to the feelings of his local Pharisees and Sadducees. The government of Rome had the simplicity of autocratic rule. 'The perfection of the Roman 'system was its union of all authority in one person.' It was 'held by force supplemented by assimilation.'* The statement does not apply to either portion of the Britannic realm. That part

* Lucas, 'Greater Rome and Greater Britain,' pp. 135–156.

which we hold by force we do not assimilate ; the part which has been assimilated from the outset we do not hold by force. The Roman government, democratic in origin, became a pure despotism, based, it is true, on the general assent of the vast mass of subjects who were deprived of political rights. The British is a combination of subject dependencies and completely free democracies. It is, in fact, as Sir Charles Lucas says, not one Empire but two Empires, an Empire of rule and an Empire of settlement. The link of Great Britain—the ruler in the one sphere, the managing and predominant partner in the other—has kept the whole together.

No Roman statesman was ever confronted by a task at all analogous to that of the British Minister who has to consider *Imperium et Libertas* under such conditions. That the task can be achieved without some closer and more scientifically adjusted political organisation than that which at present exists, seems increasingly improbable.

Here at least the comparative study of the other Empires may be fruitful. The Romans were content with good government, and in the main they secured it. We have to provide not only for good government but for self-government ; and the two ideals, if not, as Lord Cromer suggests, contradictory, are at any rate not easy to reconcile. But there is one other point which emerges from the history of the first four centuries of our era. It has been said, and constantly repeated, that the Roman Empire rested on force, while the British is sustained, in the main, by sentiment. But it was not force alone that kept the dominion of the Caesars together. The bonds that may be called ' sentimental,' that are at least intangible, were as effective as the swords of the legions. There were elements of unity for which we have much feebler counterparts or none at all. Chief of these was the overwhelming prestige of Rome, the *magni nominis umbra*, the shadow that long awed and chilled the wildest tribes and the fiercest insurgents, a prestige such as the Church held through the Middle Ages, such as in a lesser degree China, unarmed and defenceless, kept for many centuries in Asia. This was in essence based on intellectual, more than material, power. It was the consciousness of a common social and political order, a common and supreme civilisation, a common legal system, a common heritage of learning and tradition, a common body of literature and thought.

The Latin poets and the Greek philosophers were read by educated persons from the Euphrates to the Tweed, who felt a sense of equal proprietorship in Virgil and Homer and the Attic tragedians, and had no culture to choose from which was not Graeco-Roman because none other seemed worth attention. The descendant of conquered Iceni and Lusitanians would have been a Roman from choice even if he had not been one by compulsion. Aristotle speaks of that empire which is fixed in the souls and the thoughts of men. Such, with all its greed, its arrogance, its narrowed sympathies, its rigid formalism, its merciless discipline, was the Empire of Rome. And such also the Empire of Britain may become, though in this case the goal is harder to reach, and a far larger vision, a fuller measure of constructive wisdom, may be needed to attain it.

SIDNEY LOW

No. 450 will be published in October.

The Edinburgh Review

OCTOBER, 1914 No. 450

GERMANISM AND PRUSSIANISM

1. **Why we are at War.** By Members of the Oxford Faculty of Modern History. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1914.
2. **Pan-Germanism.** By ROLAND G. USHER, Ph.D. Constable and Co. 1913.
3. **Imperial Germany.** By PRINCE BERNHARD VON BÜLOW. Cassell and Co. 1914.
4. **The Evolution of Modern Germany.** By WILLIAM HARBUTT DAWSON. New Edition. Fisher Unwin. 1914.
5. **Germany and England.** By J. A. CRAMB, M.A., with a Preface by A. C. BRADLEY, LL.D. John Murray. 1914.
6. **Political and Literary Essays.** Second Series. By the EARL OF CROMER. Macmillan and Co. 1914.
7. **History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century.** By G. P. GOOCH. Longmans and Co. 1913.
8. **The Memoirs of Francesco Crispi.** Translated by MARY PRICHARD-AGNETI. 3 vols. Hodder and Stoughton. 1912.

I

THE average newspaper reader in Britain has become familiar during the past few weeks with the names of some of the writers who have done much to mould modern German sentiment. Since the war broke out he has been treated to a constant reiteration of a few quotations from Treitschke, Nietzsche, Clausewitz, and Bernhardi. One meets

All rights reserved.

these telling passages again and again in leading articles, pamphlets, letters to the editor, lectures, platform addresses. Thanks to convenient cheap editions and useful extracts the student can congratulate himself on acquiring some knowledge of the subject without laborious research. He is sometimes more zealous than critical. One reads impassioned onslaughts on Treitschke by writers who have not yet learned to spell his name correctly.* Few, I think, of those who speak so freely of this erring historian are able to read him in the original, nor do they know how much he has had to teach modern Germany besides those rancorous precepts so often repeated. Nor perhaps do they understand that General Bernhardi is not deemed quite so authoritative a writer in his own country as he appears to be considered here by the thousands who peruse his intentionally sensational pages. Our study of the Prussian spirit has been begun too late and too hurriedly to be critical.

It is much to be regretted that we did not take to it seriously some time ago. The literature and thought of modern Germany have been grossly neglected in this country except by specialists. Some knowledge of the German language for colloquial purposes is rather widely diffused ; for many people have business relations with German firms, and many others have been accustomed to visit Germany and Austria for health or pleasure. But small use seems to be made of this accomplishment for other than purely practical purposes. Even among Englishmen of good education there are few who dip into a German book from one year's end to another. The greater German writers are little read, outside the schoolroom ; and if one or two popular novelists and dramatists, like Hauptmann and Sudermann, and one or two popular theologians such as Eucken and Harnack, have penetrated to us in translations, there is little consciousness of the vigorous literary activity which has manifested itself in Germany since the era of the classic poets closed. As for the historians and the events they treat of, acquaintance with them is almost confined to a limited body of professors and publicists. We

* In a popular magazine he is referred to frequently as 'Traitschke,' and in an article in one of the leading London newspapers at the beginning of September he is called 'Treschke.'

are apt to forget that Treitschke is only one of a large group—Sybel, Droysen, Giesebrecht, Dahlmann, Häusser, and others—who used their learning and talent, as one of them said, 'to 'express and justify the love and belief in the fatherland.' Perverted and mischievous as the expression of this belief has often been, it was worth our attention. To Englishmen, who know little of their own history, and hardly anything of the history of other countries, it might have been instructive to appreciate the passionate enthusiasm with which the Germans have studied the annals of their past, the feverish emotion with which they were impelled to draw from it lessons for their future.

If our discovery of the Prussian school of history and political philosophy had been made sooner and in less fragmentary fashion it might have taught us a good deal. We could have derived from it that perception of the aims and purposes of modern Germany which now has come to many of us as a surprising and disconcerting revelation. We should have had a better grasp of the difficulties under which the Germans have chafed and fretted, as well as of the perilous and malign methods by which they have been advised to seek relief. We should have found it easier to understand the process by which Germanism has become Prussianism, and we might have taken the measure betimes of that portentous military and bureaucratic tyranny with which we are now at length engaged in conflict to the death.

II

Prussianism, like every other organism, is the result of evolution, and the shaping hand of circumstance. If the Prussian, when he looked into history, drew evil and perverted deductions from it, if it led him to believe in violence, war, despotism, and a remorseless national egoism, we cannot wholly wonder; for to him Clio must sometimes have appeared as a Fury rather than a Muse. She showed him in the Germany of the Middle Ages and the Renaissance a country in the forefront of contemporary civilisation; a country, as things were, rich, prosperous, powerful, great in arts and arms; the mother of heroes, and of singers and painters and architects; a country of great nobles and busy trading cities,

the Germany of the Hohenstaufen, of the Meistersingers, of Ulrich von Hutten, of Albert Dürer, of the cathedral-builders, of the Hansa league. And then she might bid him turn to the Germany that appeared after the Thirty Years War, and look upon her territory sundered into fragments, her fields torn by the hoof of hostile cavalry, her roads scarred by the wheels of invading cannon, the sport of foreign intrigue and ambition, the prey of a crowd of petty despots, weakened by internal jealousies, left stranded to philosophise and dream, while the Anglo-Saxon and the Latin peoples fought for the mastery of the world.

It was this impotent, divided Germany that was gradually compacted and consolidated round the stern dynasty of soldier-princes who had set up their barrack on the Mark of Brandenburg; province and principality, seized by force or gained by fraud, was built into the Prussian state, till that state itself became the centre and citadel of the Empire, and round it there gathered a united Germany, once more the mightiest power in Europe. And the Germans saw, or thought they saw, that this imposing result had been achieved, in the memorable words of Bismarck, not by laws or parliaments, 'not ' by speeches and majority resolutions, but by blood and iron.'

For the Prussian it was easier than it was for his kindred of the South and West to be absorbed, even obsessed, by this perception. Of the greatness of Germany in the intellectual and the artistic sphere Prussia and the Prussian monarchy could claim little share. It was the small states, the small courts, that gave Germany her poets, her thinkers, most of her philosophers, her noblest music. It was the divided, enfeebled Germany, the Germany of the minor kings and princes, and of denationalised Austria, that enriched the world with Richter and Goethe and Schiller and Lessing, with Mozart and Schubert and Beethoven and Wagner: not the Germany of Frederick and Blücher, of Gneisenau and Scharnhorst and Moltke.

'But the people [says Prince von Bülow] who lived on the sandy soil of the Marches, in the plains east of the Elbe and Oder, so scantily favoured by Nature, during the centuries which witnessed the growth of German culture in other parts of the country, prepared the future of Germany as a state, in battles and privations, under the rule of heroic and politic kings.'

Prussia had grown great, and made Germany great, by war, and rapine, and conquest, by Silesia seizures, Polish partitions, Bismarckian stratagems, by the sword of Leipzig and the needle-gun of Sadowa and Gravelotte. So the Swabian and the Saxon yield to the sway of the Prussian spirit, and the haunting voices of wood and valley are drowned by the heavy tread of the Potsdam drill-sergeant, the clanging hammers of Krupp.

The history of the Hohenzollern monarchy is a history of remorseless struggle against opposing ambitions and unfavourable conditions. It is full of violence and unscrupulous aggression; but a Prussian king might at almost any time have said as another potentate did: 'I could be an 'honest man if it were not for that accursed science of 'geography.' With Prussia geography had dealt more hardly than with most countries. Squeezed in among powerful and hostile neighbours, she had to fight for breath, for air-way and sea-way, against one jealous rival after another, against Sweden, Poland, Austria, France. If she would not be throttled herself she had to tear at others, to force them to give her room to move her limbs. The process has left its mark upon her policy and temper: to a Prussian statesman it seems more natural to 'hack a way' through the territory of an unoffending neighbour than it would be to public men elsewhere. It is a process that has preyed upon modern German nerves, and left them disordered. For geography, so the German thinks, is still against him. He is unable to cast his eye upon the map of Europe without a tremor. Mighty as the Empire is in these times, it has never felt secure, beset on three sides by great military powers, two of them almost its equal in armed strength, one superior in numbers and resources. With a limited and rather poor territory, and a great and growing population, Germany feels oppressed and constricted as Prussia was in the eighteenth century. She seeks to expand; but she has no free space for expansion. She has been disturbed by the nightmare of a Slav avalanche impending upon her simultaneously with a Gallic onslaught; at the back of many German minds has lingered the memory of the era of weakness and alien aggression.

Panic and ambition combined have produced a temper of

feverish unrest. The Prussian ruling caste and the Prussian professors have found it easy to inculcate the old Prussian remedy of cutting the knot by force when the occasion offered. It was war, successful war under a military autocracy, which saved and built up Prussia in the past; let war then still preserve her and increase her greatness in the future. And that is one reason why war, which to other peoples has always seemed a remote and direful contingency, to be regarded with abhorrence, has been an honoured cult in Germany under Prussian ascendancy; why books on war are published by the score every year, and read by the thousand; why the image of war is set up and worshipped in cottage and castle and lecture-room; why the aspirations after true democratic and constitutional rule break in vain against the rock of Hohenzollern militarism. It would be superfluous to refer again to the much-quoted and provocative phrases in which such writers as Bernhardi insist upon the virtue, and even the desirability, of war and of the emotions which war excites. But the sentiment is not confined to cavalry officers and Pan-Germanic enthusiasts. Prince von Bülow is no fire-eater, nor is Prussian junkerdom of the high-nosed type congenial to him. He is on the contrary open-minded and receptive. Yet this conciliatory statesman is no less convinced than any spur-clicking lieutenant or desk-banging professor of *Weltpolitik* that Germany's supreme duty, her most instant and pressing business, is to keep her sword sharp and her harness bright. The lesson which history and geography alike convey to him is that since war is almost bound to come sooner or later, and since indeed it is necessary to salvation,* nothing should be done to impair the system by which alone it can be waged with success. The head of the state should be the commander-in-chief of an army, he ought to take for his advisers civil and military administrators who should be responsible not to the electorate or the legislature but to himself. The nation may criticise, but it must obey; discipline and obedience are the prime conditions of military efficiency.

Discipline, obedience, and submission to authority are the qualities which the Prussian monarchy first imposed upon its

* Prince von Bülow quotes with approval Moltke's dictum: 'War is an essential element in God's scheme of the world.'

own subjects and then upon all Germany. 'Prussia attained 'her greatness as a country of soldiers and officials, and as 'such she was able to accomplish the work of German union; 'to this day she is still in essentials a state of soldiers and 'officials.' Since 1870 the South and West have accepted that principle. Germany, in sentiment and feeling largely democratic, has nevertheless allowed herself to be made a great war machine, under the control of Prussian officers and adminstrators, because she has been led to believe that only by this means can her destiny be fulfilled. That is why she has allowed herself to be Prussianised: not quite willingly or happily but in the conviction that thereby, and not otherwise, she can reach the consummation of her ambition as a 'World-'Power,' and the maintenance of her national unity and identity.

III

These points, or some of them, have been brought home to our consciousness of late. We might with advantage to ourselves, perhaps also to Germany, have come to close quarters with them some years ago. We have had to face those two elements of German ambition and German apprehensiveness, and we might have made a more logical and consistent attempt either to allay the one or to take due precautions against the other. We should have seen that, so far as Germany's aim at expansion outside her own borders, and particularly outside Europe, was to be gratified at our expense, we could only meet it with unhesitating opposition. This might have been made clear at the outset. If the German Government had been given to understand, beyond the possibility of error, that there could be no friendship or guarantee of enduring peace between Great Britain and any nation that sought to challenge our supremacy at sea, it is conceivable that it might have desisted from a costly, dangerous, and entirely misdirected enterprise. We should at least have discovered, in good time, whether the ruling groups were really bent on following the advice of those who were urging Germany towards a goal that could only be reached through the downfall of the British Empire. Towards a Germany, determined to strike at the source not merely of our power but of our existence, we could

only be hostile. On the other hand, for a Germany glancing nervously from the Slav spectre to the shadow of Gallic revenge we could have a certain measure of sympathetic forbearance. That was recognised by Sir Edward Grey in the final stage of the hurried transactions of last July which preceded the tragedy. In a conversation with M. Cambon on the 29th of July, he pointed out to the French Ambassador that 'in a 'Balkan quarrel, and in a struggle for supremacy between 'Teuton and Slav we should not feel called to intervene.' * The following day he carried the matter further in a despatch to the British Ambassador in Berlin :

'If the peace of Europe can be preserved, and the present crisis safely passed, my own endeavour will be to promote some arrangement to which Germany could be a party, by which she could be assured that no aggressive or hostile policy would be pursued against her or her allies by France, Russia, and ourselves, jointly or separately.'

Matters had gone too far for this statesmanlike and conciliatory proposal to be fruitful at the time. Germany had then made up her mind upon the war which she precipitated by the ultimatums to both Russia and France. Yet it is probably the case that there had been a party at the German Foreign Office which was not unfavourable to an amicable understanding with England. So far as its members were sincere they had to contend with the determination of the Prussian General Staff and the military group about the Kaiser to bring on the 'inevitable' war with France and Russia, and to insist on ignoring the obligations cast upon this country by the Anglo-French *entente*.

In the light of events it is not easy to regard the indefinite Anglo-French understanding with the enthusiasm often lavished upon it. It was a half-measure, and had the defect of most half-measures ; it was either too weak or too strong. The moment we had agreed with France to lighten our task in the Mediterranean by transferring her main fleet to that sea, we had obviously committed ourselves to secure her northern and western coasts from attack. Even if she had

---

* *Correspondence respecting the European Crisis* [Cd. 7467], p. 47.

been the aggressor we could not have escaped the obligation to render her some amount of assistance; particularly as it has been well known that the violation of Belgian neutrality was an essential part of the German strategic scheme in a campaign against France. The weakness of the *entente* was that though it bound us to aid France the extent of the obligation was undefined, or at any rate undisclosed. Hence while it angered and disturbed the Germans it left them uncertain as to its precise limits. If we had pledged ourselves by treaty to assist France with all our forces when attacked, Germany would have known where she stood, and would have been under no temptation to imperil the peace of Europe by 'testing the *entente*.' And we should have faced our own liabilities with sincerity and have placed ourselves in a proper situation to cope with them. Knowing that France could call upon us to draw the sword with her, we should have had the weapon ready. It is difficult to understand how the statesmen, who devised or maintained the *entente* and the naval arrangement with France, could have rested content with a military system which rendered it impossible to send more than three army corps to the Continent of Europe on the outbreak of war. The force which Lord Kitchener is now engaged in organising ought to have been created in 1911 if not in 1905. We ought, in fact, to have understood modern Germanism, and decided how we would treat it. Germany, we should have seen, was resolved, in every fibre of her being, to expand. Such expansion must be at the expense of some other states, in Europe and elsewhere. We might, of course, have decided that this process, whether carried on against Russia, the French colonies, or the Balkan and Turkish communities, was no affair of ours; and in that case we could have resolved to watch it unmoved, provided, which was extremely improbable, that we could exact sufficient guarantees for the security of our own interests, possessions, and treaty-rights. If, on the other hand, we were convinced that this ambition must necessarily bring Germany into collision with us, as it has done, and was no doubt bound to do, we should have been prepared to meet the shock. The *entente* should have become an alliance; which must have involved not only a great navy but that army on the European scale which we are now so hurriedly constructing.

IV

Prussia converted Germany to the Prussian idea largely by making itself the exponent and the representative of the sentiment which had been fermenting in Germany during the era of effacement and disunion. Germany emerged from her victorious campaigns with a new self-consciousness, a sudden, overwhelming confidence in herself. She thought the opportunity had at last come to stamp upon the world the impress of that intellectual energy to which the world had never paid the full appreciation she believed it merited. Why was it, asked the indignant Teuton, that the German spirit, so triumphantly capable of expressing itself in the realms of religion, of philosophy, of science, of learning, of music, so genial in peace, so valiant in war—why was it undervalued and obscured? The French, frivolous and superficial, the English, those clumsy island traders, had usurped the regions which the German soul, so rich and gifted, should dominate. To talk of German culture seems absurd enough when we think of the events of the past weeks, of Louvain, Malines, Termonde, and Reims. Culture—from these modern apostles of Attila, these warriors who bombard noble cathedrals, and burn priceless libraries! Yet it is true enough that the Germans have vaguely aimed at something besides mere material greatness, at a dominion over the minds and spirits of men. Professor Cramb is doubtless right when he says:

> 'Force alone, violence or brute strength, by its mere silent presence or by its loud manifestation in war, may be necessary to establish this dominion; but its ends are spiritual. The triumph of the Empire will be the triumph of German culture, of the German world-vision in all the phases and departments in human life and energy, in religion, poetry, science, art, politics, and social endeavour. The characteristics of this German world-vision, the benefits which its predominance is likely to confer upon mankind are, a German would allege, truth instead of falsehood in the deepest and gravest pre-occupation of the human mind.'

Ludicrous as is the German denunciation of us for allying ourselves with such 'inferior civilisations' as those of Russia

and Japan in the present war, it does not seem so to its authors. The modern German has worked himself into the frame of mind to believe, quite honestly, that there is no genuine enlightenment, no true presentation of the human character in its highest aspects, except that which is the monopoly of the Germanic people. Some small share may be allotted to the outlying branches of the stock like the English and the Scandinavians; but its home and haunt is in the territory which now constitutes the German state.

If history and geography have contributed to the Prussian conception of political action, it is another science or pseudo-science which has inspired the prophets of Germanism. They are the victims of a false ethnology as much as a perverted ethic. The two indeed have worked hand in hand to create that monstrous legend which has caused Germany to become the armed menace of Europe, and has brought upon her the dislike or the active hostility of so many nations. In the pocket of an officer of General von Kluck's army, captured in the advance upon Paris, there was found a Diary which contained suggestive entries. 'At last the Day! To have 'lived to see it! We are ready; let him come who may. 'The World-Race (*Weltrasse*) is destined to be German.' Another passage from this instructive pocket-book is worth giving. '*Vorwaerts! Immer Vorwaerts!* To-night William 'the Greater has given us beautiful advice. "You think 'each day of your Emperor. Do not forget God."' This complaisant patronage of the Deity is in 'William the Greater's' best manner; but it only draws from the diarist the reverential comment: 'His Majesty should remember that in thinking 'of him we think of God, for is he not the Almighty's instrument 'in this glorious fight for Right?' *

This is characteristic and no doubt sincere. The Herr Lieutenant had obviously imbibed the modern German belief in a tribal God. The Germans, according to this theology,

* The officer on the 25th of August writes: 'This may be war; but it is the Imperial wish that we carry it on in a manner befitting the most highly cultivated of people.' Ten days later this member of the highly cultivated force which ravaged Belgium has the following interesting note: 'One of our shells burst on a Red Cross wagon. Full of English! Ha! ha! Serve the swine right.'

are the chosen people in the special charge of a beneficent Providence who has bestowed upon them the lordship of the earth. If the lesser folk dispute this hegemony they are clearly flying in the face of the divine decree, and must be chastened with the mighty instrument forged and welded for that beneficent purpose. *Wir sind die Weltrasse!* It would be easy to multiply amplifications of that text, impressive in its arrogant simplicity. Almost the whole of Houston Stewart Chamberlain's elaborate eulogy of Germanism and the Germanic idea is a commentary upon it. The two massive volumes of 'Die Grundlagen des Neunzehnten 'Jahrhunderts' may be summed up in these four words. The book is a brilliant, ingenious, irritatingly attractive essay on the same theme.

The 'Germanic' is not merely the World-Race, it is the only race to which the world owes anything; the only one which is really 'pure,' as distinct from the 'mongrels' who inhabit the greater part of Southern Europe and the East; the only one, except perhaps the Indo-Aryans (who are very nearly Germanic), with any real sense of religion and art; the only source of genuine poetry, philosophy, and culture; the prime exponent of valour in war and order in peace. If such qualities may happen to have appeared at times among other stocks that is because these stocks have been penetrated by a 'Germanic' strain, to which they owe such merits as they may have exhibited. Dante was a German; so were Michelangelo, and Lionardo da Vinci, and St. Francis of Assisi, and Pascal. The ruling aristocracies of ancient Greece and Rome, of medieval Spain, France, Italy, were Germans; the Serbs, the most efficient and capable of the Balkan peoples, (they seem to be justifying the eulogy just now at the expense of a Germanic dynasty,) are pure Germans; the Celts are as Germanic as the Franks; so are all the best elements in Russia, Poland, Portugal, and Spain. Even among the Jews, who are specially held up to reproach as non-Germanic 'mongrels' of an aggravated type, the few really great men may belong to the elect variety. David was probably a German; so doubtless was St. Paul—he came from Cilicia, obviously a variant of Silesia; and the climax is reached in a protracted excursus upon the genealogy of the earthly parents of Christ, which if it means anything means

that He was certainly not a Jew and might very well have been a German.*

All this is only the exaggeration of a thesis which found plenty of supporters among ourselves in the nineteenth century. The Germanic idea was once almost as popular among English scholars as it is in Germany to-day with the public at large. In the revulsion against Gallic and Latin influence, of which the origin is probably to be found in the feeling roused by the Napoleonic wars, there was a tendency to over-emphasise the Teutonic element in our character and institutions, and to magnify the supposed Teutonic traits. Coleridge set the fashion, followed by De Quincey and others, of contrasting the strength and sobriety of the 'Saxon' culture with the assumed levity of the French. Then came Carlyle with his vehement presentation of the same contrast, his resounding eulogies of German writers, and his sustained effort to exhibit Frederick the Great as the embodied representative of the heroic Teuton type, a type to be commended and admired even in this ruthless and cynical form. When we condemn the Machiavellian morals of the Prussian professors it is worth while to remember that it was Carlyle who 'began it,' Carlyle with his apologetics for violence and antinomianism, his exaggerated worship of success, his intolerance of failure. It was Carlyle who did more than we commonly recognise to give respectability and orthodoxy to the Prussian legend in Prussia itself; and it was Carlyle who, as late as 1870, was describing the collapse of France before Germany as the most beneficent thing that had happened in the universe since he had been in it, and explaining 'how 'Sathanas went forth breathing boasting and blasphemy and 'hell-fire, and St. Michael, with a few strokes of his glittering 'sword, brayed the monster in the chest.' This is quite in

---

* The late Dr. Emil Reich in an entertaining little brochure called 'Germany's Swelled Head' says that J. L. Reimer in 'Ein Pangermanisches Deutschland' (1905) is even bolder than Chamberlain, and declares that Christ not only might have been but *was* a German. Even the name Jesus proves it. "The first syllable *Jes* is clearly an altered *Ger-*, the letter *r* being frequently treated as a vowel, and so dropped altogether, or changed into *s*. The second syllable *-us* is only the Latin ending for males, hence equal to the German (or English) *man*!"

the vein of the German Emperor, who regards himself as God's vicegerent on earth, and his opponents as the children of the devil.

If our preachers and prophets gave the Germans some excuse for believing themselves a chosen and specially gifted race, so also did our scholars. The reaction against Gallicism and Latinism and Celticism extended to the study and the lecture-room, and ran in full flood until Matthew Arnold began to turn the tide back. The most influential historians of the Victorian period not only accepted the 'Germanic' theory, but made it the basis of their researches and speculations. The English, it was insisted, were a 'Saxon' people, a branch of the great Teutonic stem, the noblest growth from the bounteous 'Aryan' root, and pretty nearly all their distinctive qualities, and their most valued institutions, drew their merits from this source. It is in the Thuringian forests, or in the valleys of Uri and Unterwalden, or the water-levels of the Elbe and Weser, that we must trace the beginnings of English liberty, the English parliament, English self-government. The hypothesis was put forward with angry iteration by Freeman, it was urged with quiet conviction by Stubbs, whose 'Constitutional History' was largely built up on this text; it appears in a more subtle but not less persuasive form throughout the works of Froude and Macaulay; it was brought home to boys and girls and the general reader by John Richard Green in the most popular 'Short History' ever written. It was only here and there that an influential voice like Huxley's was raised to vindicate the Celtic part in the making of Britain, and not till later that scholars like Maitland and Fustel de Coulanges reasserted the share of Rome in the moulding of British institutions. The Teutonic theory long held the field, and it was pressed to its furthest limits. Take, for example, this passage from Arnold's 'Lectures on Modern History,' where we are told that practically all modern civilisation worth having is due to the German element:

'It affects, more or less, the whole west of Europe, from the head of the Gulf of Bothnia to the most southern promontory of Sicily, from the Oder and the Adriatic to the Hebrides and to Lisbon. It is true that the language spoken over a large portion of this space is not predominantly German; but even in France and Italy and Spain, the influence of the Franks, Burgundians,

Visigoths, Ostrogoths, and Lombards, while it has coloured the language, has in blood and institutions left its mark legibly and indelibly. . . . I say nothing of the prospects and influence of the German race in Africa and in India: it is enough to say that half of Europe, *and all America and Australia*, are German, more or less completely, in race, in language, or in institutions, or in all.'

Mr. Houston Stewart Chamberlain himself could hardly go much further in proclaiming the supremacy of Germanism. No doubt these English writers implied that only in the 'Low 'German,' the Anglo-Saxon, variety were the best characteristics of the Teutonic race developed. In the German universities they naturally viewed the matter otherwise. England, they said, by the admission of its own authorities was only an adjunct, an offshoot, of the great Germanic culture-system, which found its perfect expression in the home and centre of the parent stock. *Wir sind die Weltrasse.*

V

In Great Britain all these literary and learned disquisitions were of the profoundest practical unimportance. We may be interested by the investigations or the suggestions of our writers and thinkers; but we do not regulate the conduct of our affairs by them, particularly the conduct of our political affairs. An English statesman in Queen Victoria's reign might have been a devoted admirer of Carlyle, or an ardent believer in Herbert Spencer; but it would never have occurred to him to support a Bill before the House of Commons by a reference to the tenets of either teacher. No Anglo-Indian administrator, though well acquainted with the works of Max Müller, would have been in the least affected in his attitude towards the people he governed by the consideration that they were (or were not) 'Aryans.' We are accustomed to look at facts, and to deal with the emergency as it arises, with as much wisdom and justice as we can command, without as a rule close reference to any systematic body of thought. We do not trouble to think things out; we prefer to work them out.

The German temper is different. Even in these days of *Realpolitik* the German is a theorist, and in his public, as well as his personal, conduct he seeks to fortify himself with

a reasoned scheme of general principles. 'The parties,' says Prince von Bülow, 'would like to be distinguished from one 'another even in their grasp of intellectual, and their concep- 'tion of practical, life. Party views are to become a *Welt- 'anschauung.*' An English friend once told the Prince that it struck him how often the words 'Conception of the Universe' occurred in German parliamentary speeches. Over and over again he found, 'From the point of view of my conception 'of the Universe.' We are not surprised that the British inquirer 'remarked, as he shook his head, that English 'politicians and members of Parliament did not know much 'about such things.' Englishmen, in politics, get on quite comfortably without a *Weltanschauung.* Germans require it for daily use; and when this 'Conception of the Universe' takes the form of the innate and inherent superiority of the German people, it is only natural that it should prepare to express itself sooner or later in action.

In England all the dangerous ethics and fantastic ethnology of perverted geniuses would only have set us talking. In Germany they seem to have induced quite a large number of otherwise sane and sensible persons to believe that any war would be righteous if it were waged to impress upon a sceptical and reluctant world the consciousness of German superiority.

The romanticism of the older Germany has passed into this new realism which has been fostered by the immense access of material prosperity of the past three decades. When one remembers how swiftly Germany has shot into the very foremost rank of industrial nations, one may be the less surprised if her people are inclined to exaggerate the attributes which have brought them to this height. Energy, skill, resourcefulness, science, ingenuity, and forethought have the Germans brought to bear on the tasks of the office, the factory, and the shop, as well as an invincible contempt for the scruples and conventions which bind their rivals. They find that they have the aptitudes which make for success in an age given up to action, to adventure, to the triumph of the will, to the assertion of power in all its forms, human and mechanical. Should they refuse to believe the mentors who assure them that they of all others are framed to prevail in such circumstances as these, that they need only put forth their strength to win the foremost place of all? If one condition was that

they should submit to the maintenance of the Prussian autocracy there are many Germans who have been persuaded that the price was worth paying.

'Our task,' says Prince von Bülow, 'must be the unity of 'our intellectual and political life, that is the fusion of the 'Prussian and the German spirit. Prussian state life and 'German intellectual life must become reconciled in such a 'way that both their growths become entwined without 'weakening one another.' Such a harmony, the Prince admits, has not as yet been achieved. In the stifling embrace of Prussianism the spiritual freedom, the artistic insight, the grace and charm of the older and greater Germany have disappeared; its intellect has bent itself to the office of finding a philosophical or historical justification for the Hohenzollern doctrine of Might is Right. The Prussian boot has trampled Swabian humanity and idealism into the dust of the parade-ground. The divinity whose name is so seldom absent from the German Emperor's lips is, as Heine predicted, a savage pagan deity, the Thor of the fierce Scandinavian mythology, with his death-dealing hammer, rather than the God of liberty and light whom the poets of the War of Liberation hymned. How different the imperial vapouring from the generous freedom-loving patriotism that rings through the verses of Körner and Herwegh, of Arndt and Wilhelm Müller!

'God, Who gave man iron, we render thanks to Thee,
Thine intent it was that we should use it to be free;
Lance and sword, the gifts were Thine, ours to hold them fast,
That the right should triumph and the wrong be overcast.
Make our courage firm, O Lord, give us strength to die,
So that we may strike to death the boasting and the lie.'

Not in this mood does Potsdam exhort its disciples. Prussia has imparted to all Germany that kind of insolent egoism and pride which the ancient Greeks called *ὕβρις* and held that the gods would surely visit with failure and humiliation. In their contempt for others, their overweening self-confidence, their haughty intolerance, their defiant trust in their own valour and capacity, the Germans, like the ancient Persians, think themselves super-men.* But in the end, we are

* *Πέρσαι φύσιν ἐόντες ὑβρισταί.* Herodotus, i. 89. The root is probably that found in *super, superbus.*

reminded that justice prevails over arrogance—δίκη ὑπὲρ ὕβριος ἴσχει.* And so in the end will it be here, to the immeasurable relief of the world, and of Germany herself.

VI

The Greeks thought that ὕβρις leads men to their doom by inflicting a kind of madness upon them, so that they abandon prudence and moderation, and become blind to the consequences of their deeds. And it almost seems as if this fate had befallen the rulers of modern Germany. For if they have retained the Prussian strength and valour, they have lost the keen sagacity which guided Prussia through its storm-beaten voyage to success. We sometimes hear that this war is the legacy of Bismarck. It may be due in part to the Bismarckian temper; but assuredly Bismarck's policy has been misunderstood, his precepts have been recklessly ignored, by those who have brought about the calamity. The last thing that Bismarck would have desired, the thing indeed he most sedulously sought to prevent, was that United Germany should come to be regarded as an armed menace to the world. For that reason he gave little encouragement to the idea of extra-European expansion, and though he was reluctantly impelled by the mercantile and financial interests to take part in the scramble for Africa he regarded colonial and naval enterprises with distrust. To the end of his life he declared that he was 'still no colony man.'

The Great Navy is a creation of the post-Bismarckian era. It is the present Emperor, not the statesman he drove from office, who invented or popularised the aphorism that 'the 'future lies upon the water.' Bismarck felt that Germany would have quite enough to occupy her on land for some generations to come. His policy, though often enough aggressive in its tactical details, was in its main strategy defensive; its aim was first to consolidate the revived German nation, and then to protect it from external assault. 'We ask nothing of 'others,' he said to Crispi in 1877, 'and we are loyal to our 'treaties; but we must feel safe at home.' He knew that German unity had been won by violence, conquest, and

* Hesiod, 'Op.' 215.

unscrupulous stratagem ; he was prepared to maintain it by the same means ; but he had no wish to aggravate the inherent dangers of the situation by rousing gratuitous antagonism in any quarter. He considered that Germany held the place she had asserted for herself in the European states-system by a precarious tenure, in any case ; and it was above all things essential not to sacrifice what she had gained by provoking her enemies and rivals to combine for her destruction.

For this reason Bismarck confessed that the mere hint of a hostile coalition gave him a nightmare. The enmity of France he regarded as a constant quantity, one that could not be eliminated from calculation, at least until a long interval of time had elapsed ; but he hoped that by adroit management France could be prevented from providing herself with allies in any active policy directed against Germany. On this account he ' kept the road open to Peterhof,' shunned occasions of quarrel with Russia, and gave his blessing to the British occupation of Egypt in the expectation, abundantly justified by events, that it would be a fruitful source of friction between the two Western Powers. In 1905 and 1911 Germany was in the mood to go to war with France over Morocco. Thirty years earlier Bismarck regarded the alleged French designs upon the sultanate with equanimity, holding that the more France chose to occupy herself in Africa the less likely would she be to disturb Germany's position in Europe.

For England he had no particular affection : he may probably have believed, with writers of the Treitschke school, that the British Empire lay athwart the path of German international ambitions ; but he was careful all the same to avoid drawing us into the circle of Germany's adversaries, and he perceived the folly and peril of challenging our maritime supremacy. A nightmare, indeed, it would have been to Bismarck if he could have foreseen the policy which has brought Britain, France, and Russia into alliance against his country.

If such a combination had seemed probable we may be certain that he would not have rushed, in a kind of frenzy, to cut through the entanglement by force of arms. He gauged the value of the magnificent military weapon which the Prussian soldiers had forged, but he had not the least intention of allowing them to wield it at their own discretion.

Prussia had lived by the sword; by the sword he knew that she might perish, if the ambition of the soldier was not controlled by the wisdom of the statesman. Notwithstanding his own action in 1866 and 1870 he could not admit, he says in his 'Reminiscences,' that it can be right for diplomatists deliberately to provoke a war; for 'even victorious wars cannot 'be justified unless they are forced upon one, and one cannot 'see the cards of Providence far enough ahead to anticipate 'historical development according to one's own calculation.' He adds this significant warning:

'It is natural that in the staff of the army not only younger active officers, but likewise experienced strategists, should feel the need of turning to account the efficiency of the troops led by them and their own capacity to lead, and of making them prominent in history. It would be a matter of regret if this effect of the military spirit did not exist in the army; the task of keeping its results within such limits as the nation's need of peace can justly claim is the duty of the political, not the military, heads of the State. That at the time of the Luxemburg question, during the crisis of 1878, invented by Gortchakoff and France, and even down to the most recent times, the staff and its leaders have allowed themselves to be led astray and to endanger peace, lies in the very spirit of the institution, which I would not forego. *It only becomes dangerous under a monarch whose policy lacks sense of proportion and power to resist one-sided and constitutionally unjustifiable influences.*'

These words seem prophetic enough; and they show how little of Bismarck's clear-sighted apprehension of realities there is in the Prussian leaders of to-day. Nor has their clumsy diplomacy any trace of the Bismarckian skill. Faced with the situation which they had created in July, it is inconceivable that Bismarck would have handled it with the bungling roughness that plunged Germany into a struggle with the most powerful association of enemies that could be arrayed against her. If the great Chancellor had been at the helm one may be sure that he would have made it as difficult as possible for England to come into the war, instead of rendering her participation inevitable. He would have insisted that energetic hostilities should be directed against Russia, while France would not have been attacked, and the neutrality of Belgium would have been respected. In that case the position of both Great Britain and France

would have been one of considerable embarrassment; for it would have been difficult for the government of the latter country, and perhaps impossible for that of the former, to engage in what would have then seemed to many people a gratuitous intervention in support of Russia and Servia. Bismarck would very likely have thought it worth while to secure these political advantages even at the risk of deranging the time-table strategy of the General Staff. Unfortunately for modern Germany the militarist element has had the upper hand; and the statesmanship which makes the soldier the servant of the State instead of its master has been withdrawn from her counsels, to the incalculable injury of mankind and herself. Mr. Dawson says that a well-known German military politician and ex-colonial governor stated not long ago: 'That which is lacking in our diploma-'tists we must make good by brute force.' This is the evil lesson of Prussian *Realpolitik*. It is by brute force that Germany is seeking to make good the errors of a diplomacy amazing in its ineptitude. When the effort has ended in its predestined failure it is not Europe alone that will have gained deliverance. The German spirit, also, it may be hoped, emancipating itself from the shackles of Prussianism, will recover some of its old ideals, and will set itself to rebuild the altars on which, in the fine phrase of Mr. Bonar Law, there once glowed a sacred fire that shed its radiance over the world.

SIDNEY LOW.

GERMANY AND THE LAWS OF WAR

1. **The Law of Naval Warfare.** By Lieutenant J. A. HALL, R.N.V.R. Chapman and Hall. 1914.
2. **International Law.** Part I.—Peace (1910). Part II.—War (1913). By JOHN WESTLAKE, LL.D. Cambridge University Press.
3. **Great Jurists of the World.** Edited by Sir JOHN MACDONELL, K.C.B., and EDWARD MANSON. Murray. 1913.
4. **A Treatise on International Law.** By WILLIAM EDWARD HALL. Clarendon Press. 1912.
5. **Britain and Sea Law.** By T. BATY, D.C.L. G. Bell and Sons, 1911.
6. **The Hague Peace Conferences.** By A. PEARCE HIGGINS. Cambridge University Press. 1909.

AT the end of March 1631 Count von Tilly sat down before the City of Magdeburg with 30,000 troops and heavy artillery. A few days before he had taken Neu-Brandenburg by assault, had sacked the city, and had slaughtered the surrendered garrison. A few days later Gustavus Adolphus as a reprisal put in action the foul principle of 'Neu-Brandenburg 'quarter' by sacking Frankfort and slaying the entire garrison. Tilly, despite the failure of his gift for war, so soon to become apparent at the battle of Breitenfeld, was not too old to devise new savagery, and when Magdeburg, the Maiden City, fell by assault on May 20, he not only sacked the city and destroyed the garrison, but he also slaughtered with the most fearful cruelties the greater part of the population of 36,000 souls. After the carnage had gone on for more than two days Tilly pardoned the rest of the inhabitants. The town was destroyed by fire, the Cathedral and a few other buildings alone being saved. Tilly denied that he was responsible for the fire. Count zu Pappenheim, who was in command with Tilly, admitted to the Elector of Bavaria that 'no such awful visita-'tion of God had been witnessed since the destruction of 'Jerusalem.' Sir Augustus Ward tells us that 'the moral 'impression made by the sack of Magdeburg on both friend and

'foe was without precedent or parallel even in the Thirty 'Years' War; it remains reflected in scurrilous songs of savage 'triumph, in wrathful outcries, penitential psalms, and wild 'accusations.' * But we do not agree at all with Sir Augustus Ward, when he adds that 'the main share of the infamy attaching 'to the sack of Magdeburg' should fall not on Tilly, 'but on the 'practice of the age of warfare in which he held a conspicuous 'place.' The destruction of Magdeburg was something new to mankind, and shocked the conscience of the then civilised world. It was not within the laws of war as recognised in that age. Admittedly the laws of war at that date were in a very unformulated state, but the best proof that the destruction of Magdeburg did not represent the practice of that, or, we were going to say, any other later age, is that for 283 years, despite the prevalence of war in Europe, the precedent was never deliberately followed.

It was not until after Magdeburg that a school of international jurists arose to crystallise and expand existing practices and to formulate a common law of international relations capable of growth and of meeting the requirements of successive ages, though Grotius's famous work was actually begun eight years earlier. Under the hands of great jurists (such as Grotius, Zouche, Leibniz, Puffendorf, Vico, Bynkershoek, Pothier, Vattel, Stowell) and great statesmen, there have grown up bodies of customary rules regulating warfare by land and sea, rules that have in ample measure been confirmed and enlarged by treaties and conventions. To-day the international law of war is a vast and effective corpus of jurisprudence, evolved by great minds and sanctioned by the moral natures of great peoples. Behind international law lies the best of all sanctions; not the sanction of the policeman, but the sanction that springs from universal conviction, through overwhelming moral consent: the type of sanction that makes custom more binding than law, the sanction that is written indelibly in the moral being of man.

Yet suddenly the civilised world learns that a Power which claims to direct the culture of that world has repudiated all the restraints that are bound up in the nexus of the laws of war. We have no intention here of drawing a passionate

* Cambridge Modern History, vol. 4, p. 203.

indictment of the man and the nation that have declared war on civilisation. What we desire to do is to investigate the extent of the danger and to consider the possibility of preventing its recurrence. It is for this purpose that we have drawn attention to the famous case of the stoutly defended Maiden City. The true measure of the danger is to compare that case with the case of the ancient and entirely undefended City and University of Louvain and of the successive outrages against all that mankind holds most sacred that have disgraced the German armies.

It will be convenient briefly to consider the views on the conduct of warfare that have been expressed by successive jurists. It is not uncommon to-day to read statements to the effect that Germany has carried warfare back to the methods of the Middle Ages. Nothing could be farther from the truth. Warfare in the Middle Ages was dignified by the law of chivalry and was conducted by nations in a fashion that did in fact mitigate many of the horrors of war. The blot on the warfare of the Middle Ages was the existence of the famous Free Companies that sold their lances to the highest bidder and eked out precarious subsidies with booty. But even these had definite rules of war, and in the case, the common case, when the company was led by a knight of European reputation, the practice of pillage did not involve those other horrors with which modern warfare in the Balkans and in Belgium has familiarised us. Probably the worst feature of medieval warfare was the system of raiding, even in time of peace, by privateersmen on the respective coast towns of England, France, and the Low Countries. These petty wars of reprisals give us many instances of lawless cruelty. But apart from such instances the law of chivalry was a real thing, and it was after the Renaissance and the Reformation had completed the destruction of feudalism that Europe found herself face to face with the unspeakable horrors that made the name of chivalry a lamented memory.

It was the Thirty Years' War that stimulated the genius of Grotius.

'I saw prevailing' [he wrote, in the Prolegomena to *de Jure Belli et Pacis*] 'throughout the Christian world a licence in making war of which even barbarous nations would have been ashamed; recourse being had to arms for slight reasons or no reason; and when arms

were once taken up, all reverence for divine and human law was thrown away, just as if men were thenceforth authorised to commit all crimes without restraint.'

Grotius, therefore, ransacked the records of the past and applied to the gathered material the principle, to use the words of the late Sir William Rattigan in his admirable essay on Grotius, 'that between individuals, as between nations, it is not Utility 'but a common law of Rights which is of force in governing 'their mutual relations. To have established this principle 'and to have extended its operation to the conduct of war was 'to have justified his claim to be regarded as the founder, or, 'as Marten calls him, the father, of the science of International 'Law, and to be called, as Vico suggests, "the jurisconsult of '"the human race."' He gave the death blow, as men thought, to the policy of the Machiavellian School of politicians, the policy of lies and sophistry (*des Lugs und Trugs*), of *Realpolitik*, and rendered possible, says Sir William Rattigan, the Peace of Westphalia. The work of Grotius filled the minds of men 'and became a text book in all European Universities.' The chief glory of Grotius is that, in fact, his book, by the clarity of its reasoning, so appealed to the minds of men and statesmen as to mitigate enormously in practice the horrors of war. The night before the battle of Lützen Gustavus Adolphus was reading it and he left the copy beneath his pillow when he rose to conquer and to die. It is somewhat curious that Grotius should not have developed the doctrine of neutrality. In the absence of special guarantees, he considered that it was innocuous to march troops through a neutral country that lies beween two belligerents. In fact in the seventeenth century the modern doctrine of neutrality, that it is—to use the words of the late Dr. W. E. Hall—'the Duty of a State to restrain foreign governments 'and private persons from using the territory and resources 'of a neutral country for belligerent purposes,' was quite undeveloped.

Richard Zouche marks the next stage in the laws of war. He held with Grotius that inordinate augmentation of military or naval forces by any State is a hostile act to a neighbouring State that may rightly be abated. He lays great stress on 'Rightful War.' Every means of satisfaction must be exhausted before the resort to war. He specially deals with the laws of

war in the field. He marks a definite stage in this matter. Dr. Coleman Philipson in his admirable essay on Richard Zouche points out that military discipline in war had always been a subject of peculiar attention in England :

' Regulations and ordinances were issued by John, Richard I., Richard II., Henry V. (the latter of whom ordered the protection of women and children, priests and sacred objects, and men at the plough) ; further regulations were made by Henry VII., Henry VIII., and Elizabeth ; and in the Civil War rules were drawn up for the Royal forces by the Duke of Northumberland (1640) and the " Laws and Ordinances of War " (1643) by Essex for the Parliamentary forces.'

Zouche lays down definite rules as to truce, exchange and ransom of prisoners, surrender of places. He emphatically condemns the *Lex Talionis*, the slaughter of hostages and prisoners, and discusses (says Dr. Philipson) such illegitimate practices as the ill-treatment of prisoners, of women and children ; the action of women who take up arms ; the profanation of sacred places ; the use of guile, lying, or ambush in military conferences, assassination, refusal of burial to enemies, ill-treatment of envoys, and of those who surrender, and various other practices of a like nature. These were commonplaces of the Thirty Years' War, and, so far as we are able to see, are the commonplaces of war as waged by Germany to-day. Zouche, in fine, adopted and extended the humane principles laid down by Grotius. Samuel Puffendorf unfortunately to some extent weakened the practice of humanity in war by abandoning many of the definite rules enjoined by Grotius and Zouche. Puffendorf thought that he could leave the conduct of armies in the field to the dictates of the individual consciences of officers and men. But if those consciences have been corrupted during years of peace by the continual preaching of brutality as the most effective deterrent in war, then the doctrine of Puffendorf can but lead, as it has led, to moral disaster.

Cornelius van Bynkershoek, great jurist though he was, did little to mitigate the actual horrors of war, but one principle that he lays down is of peculiar significance at this time. He definitely forbids, even in the case of necessity, the carrying of war into neutral territory, and he regards a free people conquered by force of arms as nevertheless a political personality

still capable of delivery from bondage by its allies. But wars of conquest have no attraction for him. It is only in a just cause that the use of every means to achieve the end of justice is allowable. Émerich de Vattel lays equal stress on the necessity of justice as a ground for war: War must be just. The right of making war belongs to nations only as a remedy against injustice. He dwells on the iniquity of cruelty such as the use of poison in war.

The influence of the seventeenth and eighteenth century jurists is to be seen in the conduct of armies during the Napoleonic period. Napoleon's wars were certainly not righteous, his armies were recruited from a population inflamed by suffering, revolution and the fear of the extinction of national life, yet it may be said with truth that Napoleon and his generals conducted war within the limits laid down by Grotius and Zouche. It is true that Napoleon suppressed a popular insurrection in Lombardy in 1796 with severity after the townsfolk and peasants had overwhelmed the French garrison in Pavia, and his proclamation threatened fire and sword against villages and persons carrying on the rebellion. The same was true in Spain. It is also, of course, true that Napoleon laid down the working rule that war must maintain war. He levied enormous contributions on conquered towns and States and despatched to the public galleries of Paris, without compunction, the cream of the art treasures of Europe. But Napoleon practically always had his armies in hand. He did not imitate the malignants of the Thirty Years' War. He did not destroy for the sake of destruction. Women, children, priests, and other non-combatants were safe in the hands of his armies. The pillaging and burning of cities, the murder of prisoners and of hostages were no part of his plan of campaign. Probably no French army ever behaved as badly as did the Prussian army under Blücher.

Forty years after Waterloo we find a new development in the laws of war. The practices of chivalry in the Middle Ages had laid the basis of humane usages. The jurists who protested against the horrors of the Thirty Years' War incorporated the earlier usages and laid down general principles that appealed to the consciences of men. But these general principles as laid down and interpreted by Grotius, Selden, Bynkershoek, and Stowell still left room for grave differences of opinion,

especially between neutrals and belligerents. The next stage was to supplement the law of custom and of conscience by definite international conventions. The Declaration of Paris of 1856 bound the signatory Powers to a definite agreement upon two points of fundamental importance in maritime law, namely, first, that 'the neutral flag covers enemy's goods, with the 'exception of contraband of war,' and, secondly, that 'neutral 'goods, with the exception of contraband of war, are not 'liable to capture under the enemy's flag.' Dr. Westlake tells us in his invaluable work on International Law which only last year passed into a new edition that:

'An agitation was long maintained in England with the view of inducing this country to withdraw from the Declaration of Paris, which it was not within her power to do, that document being really a convention. . . . The United States, which refused to become a party to the Declaration because it did not completely exempt enemy property as such from capture at sea, covered by that refusal the narrower ground of enemy property under a neutral flag; and neither they nor Spain in their war of 1898, nor Japan and Russia in their war of 1904, acted contrary to the Declaration. We may therefore conclude that enemy ships and enemy goods on board them are now, by international law, the only enemy property which, as such, is capturable at sea.'

The demand for the general exemption of private enemy property at sea, though it has received considerable support from Powers that believed their interest to lie that way, is as little likely to be generally accepted as the Declaration of Paris is to be varied. The only ground on which it is urged that England should repudiate the Declaration of Paris is that it would be to our interest to capture enemy goods in neutral ships, and that we should lose little by conceding the same right to our opponents, for most of our goods come in our own ships and would thus in any case be liable to capture.

It is possible to attach too much weight to these considerations even on the material side alone; but on the moral side the case is conclusive. Even if we suffered seriously from the Declaration of Paris, we could not denounce that Declaration in our own interests and violate the guaranteed maritime rights of neutral nations at the very moment when we are waging war to enforce the sacredness of territorial neutrality guaranteed by treaty. During war time it would be impossible for England, as a nation that stands for honour, to denounce

the Declaration of Paris. After peace has been declared it would be possible, but the benefit that could possibly accrue would be minute compared with the loss involved in a course that would upset a rule of war that has now received the universal assent of the nations of the world.

The Declaration of Paris was the first general convention that defined by effective international consent the laws of war. It was speedily followed, in 1863, by the memorable 'Instructions for the Government of Armies of the United 'States in the Field.' This excellent conception of a code of laws for war on land was supplemented in 1864 by the 'Conven-'tion of Geneva for Ameliorating the condition of the wounded 'in armies in the Field' (revised in 1868 and 1906), and was followed in 1868 by the 'Declaration of St. Petersburg' which laid down certain definite principles. These principles are as follows:

'That the progress of civilisation should have the effect of alleviating as much as possible the calamities of war;

'That the only legitimate object which States should endeavour to accomplish during war is to weaken the military forces of the enemy;

'That for this purpose it is sufficient to disable the greatest possible number of men;

'That this object would be exceeded by the employment of arms which uselessly aggravate the sufferings of disabled men, or render their death inevitable;

'That the employment of such arms would therefore be contrary to the laws of humanity.'

The only immediate result of these high principles was the general agreement not to use explosive bullets of less weight than say 13½ ounces, but the principles are of extreme importance and have been regarded as of universal acceptance. To quote Dr. Westlake:

'Since in a war between civilised states the object is to break down the resistance of the enemy government, measures not aimed at the military forces of that government or the organisation and wealth which support them would exceed the object and be inhuman. And the advance of public opinion has even condemned all action in war the connection of which with the weakening of the enemy's military forces is not proximate. Slaughter of non-combatants or carrying them off as prisoners, and the devastation of territory not necessary for covering the retreat of an army or for any other directly military purpose, but intended to create general terror or

distress, may indeed help to break down resistance but are universally condemned.'

The efforts for the humane conduct of war in America, Switzerland, and Russia gave hope for the future. In 1874 a conference sat at Brussels and drafted a code to govern warlike operations on land. In 1880 the Institute of International Law issued an amending code. In 1899 all these efforts bore fruit in the regulations drawn up by the Hague Conference of that year. They were amended at the Hague Conference of 1907, and in their amended form have received the assent of nearly all the States in the world, though in a few cases with some reservations.

It will be convenient to glance at the larger rules decided by the Convention of 1907 both in regard to land warfare and naval warfare. The first two provisions of the Convention of 1907 are of profound importance to-day and we set them out in full.

'I. The laws, rights and duties of war apply not only to armies but also to militia and volunteer corps fulfilling the following conditions:

1. To have at their head a person responsible for his subordinates.
2. To have a fixed distinctive emblem recognisable at a distance.
3. To carry arms openly; and
4. To conduct their operations in accordance with the laws and customs of war.

In countries where militia or volunteer corps constitute the army or form part of it, they are included under the denomination army.

II. The population of a territory which has not been occupied, who, on the enemy's approach, spontaneously take up arms to resist the invading troops without having time to organise themselves in accordance with Article I. shall be regarded as belligerents *if they carry arms openly* and respect the laws and customs of war.'

These articles have the assent of the present belligerent Powers. The words in italics in the second article '*if they* '*carry arms openly*' were inserted, as Mr. Pearce Higgins in his indispensable work on the Hague Peace Conferences points out, on the proposition of the German delegate and were carried in committee by thirty votes to three with two abstentions.

Article IV. provides that 'prisoners of war are in the power 'of the hostile government, but not in that of the individuals 'or corps who capture them.' The article goes on to provide for their humane treatment, for the security of their private non-militant belongings, and limits their detention to internment as opposed to imprisonment. The latter is only allowed as 'an indispensable measure of safety.' Article VI. forbids the employment of prisoners in anything 'to do with the operations of 'the war.' An 'individual record for each prisoner of war' must be kept and handed over at the conclusion of peace (Article XIV.). Relief societies are allowed to help prisoners, who moreover are to be permitted to communicate with their relatives and receive financial help from them. Every facility is to be given in the matter and the lot of prisoners made as light as possible (Articles XV.–XX.). 'The obligations of belligerents with 'regard to the service of the sick and wounded are governed 'by the Geneva Convention' of 1906 which elaborately provides for the most humane treatment possible (Article XXI.) and the absolute protection of the Red Cross flag.

Article XXII. lays down the great general principle that 'the 'right of belligerents to adopt means of injuring the enemy is 'not unlimited.' Great Britain, the United States, and Austria are bound, in warfare with belligerents similarly bound, not to discharge 'projectiles or explosives from balloons or by other 'new methods of a similar nature.' Consequently it would seem that Great Britain can use these methods against Germany, but not against Austria. The use of asphyxiating gases and dum-dum bullets is forbidden. The United States has not accepted the prohibition. Article XXIII. contains a number of general prohibitions forbidding the use of poison, treachery, the refusal to grant quarter and 'the improper use of a flag of 'truce, the national flag, or military ensigns and the enemy's 'uniform, as well as the distinctive badges of the Geneva 'Convention.' With respect to this provision and the use of 'ruses of war' as permitted by Article XXIV., Dr. Westlake writes :

'No duty is violated by ruses, even to the extent of spreading false reports ; and even using the enemy's national flag, military ensigns and uniforms, being in substance spreading a false report by acts instead of words, is allowed up to the last moment before fighting, when the true colours must be resumed. An attack or

any employment of force can only be made under the external symbols of the proper nationality, or war would lose the characters on which such humanity as is possible in it depends; and the "improper use" of the enemy's symbols mentioned in H xxiii. (f) must be understood in the sense of this established usage, and not more widely.'

Frankly, we think Dr. Westlake goes too far unless the words 'the last moment before fighting' mean the beginning of an action and not merely the beginning of an attack by troops wearing the uniform of the troops they are attacking. Anything else would surely come under the general condemnation that was accorded to Murat and Lannes when they secured, just before Austerlitz, the bridge of Spitz by the false statement that an armistice had been concluded. It is certainly an 'improper use' to spoil the dead of their uniforms and to use these uniforms to obtain a position that could not be obtained by force of arms. All persons captured under such circumstances should be at once shot, for Article XXIV. by which 'ruses 'of war and the employment of methods necessary to obtain 'information about the enemy and the country are considered 'allowable,' does not delete the definite rule as to the improper use of the enemy's uniform. Dr. Westlake takes a clear view of the prohibition not 'to kill or wound treacherously indi- 'viduals belonging to the hostile nation or army' (XXIII. (b)). It includes 'killing persons who have had no reason to put 'themselves on their guard.' The point should be kept in mind. The same warning applies to Article XXIII. (g) forbidding pillage. It is especially prohibited 'to destroy or 'seize the enemy's property, unless such destruction or seizure 'be imperatively demanded by the necessities of war.' Again Article XXV. is of the first importance: 'The attack or 'bombardment by any means whatever of towns, villages, 'habitations or buildings which are not defended is prohibited.' Article XXVIII. supplements in important fashion Article XXIII. (g): 'The pillage of a town or place, even when taken 'by assault, is prohibited.'

It is worthy of the closest attention that Dr. Westlake, in dealing with the question of military authority over hostile territory, indignantly repudiates, as indeed every thinking man must repudiate, the infamous German doctrine of 'War 'Treason' (*Kriegsverrath*) applied to every act of a member

of the population of an occupied district directed against the occupying army :

> 'No act of that kind can be regarded as treasonable without violating the modern view of the nature of military occupation, and to introduce the notion of moral fault into an invader's view of what is detrimental to him, serves only to inflame his passions, and to make it less likely that he will observe the true limit of necessity in his repression of what is detrimental to him. And in the cases of giving information and serving as guides to one's own people, the attempt at sanguinary repression would have the additional demerit of inutility, since it could not succeed except among a people more abject than it would be possible to discover.'

It is certainly clear enough that the inhabitants of an occupied district, rising in organised and open insurrection, possess the privileges of combatants. Germany and Austria in 1907, however, refused to agree to Article XLIV. by which 'any compulsion of the population of occupied territory 'to furnish information about the army of the other belli-'gerent or about his means of defence is prohibited.' We know now why Germany and Austria did not consent. The German account of the execution of a boy scout for not revealing the presence of French troops should at this point be kept in mind. We are sure that Japan, Russia, and Montenegro, who also withheld their assent, will not take advantage in the present war of the liberty they reserved to themselves. Great Britain and France are, of course, also free in this respect so far as the present war is concerned, but we may be certain that they too will not use a freedom so open as we now know to abominable abuse.

It would, in ordinary circumstances, be unnecessary to mention Article XLVI. ; but in shame for humanity we give it : 'The honour and rights of the family, the lives of individuals 'and private property, as well as religious convictions and 'public worship, must be respected. Private property cannot 'be confiscated.' Article XLVIII. adds : 'Pillage is formally 'prohibited.'

Article XLIX. forbids money contributions in occupied territory (other than local taxes for normal use) except 'for 'military necessities or the administration of such territory.' Article L. declares that 'no collective penalty, pecuniary or 'other, can be inflicted on a population on account of the acts 'of individuals for which it cannot be regarded as collectively

'responsible.' Under Article LII. requisitions can only be made 'for the necessities of the army of occupation,' and must be paid for. Article LVI. is a notable provision:

'The property of communes, and that of institutions dedicated to religious worship, charity, education, art or science, even when belonging to the State, shall be treated in the same manner as private property. All seizure or destruction of, or intentional damage done to such institutions, historical monuments, or works of art or science, is prohibited and should be made the subject of prosecution.'

Generally, it must be noted that matters not covered by the Hague Regulations are to be governed by 'the usages 'established between civilised nations, the laws of humanity, 'and the requirements of the public conscience.' This, of course, includes the dreadful and imminent question of reprisals, for breach of the accepted laws of war. General Jomini, the Russian delegate at Brussels, emphasised in his speech the general repugnance felt with regard to the whole subject of reprisals. We believe that the English view will be that whatever punishment may be inflicted upon offenders against the law of nations there must be no reprisals in kind. The forces of civilisation must not visit on the German and Austrian peoples the unspeakable things that Belgium and France have suffered. Retribution must be postponed until the end of the war when the conditions of peace must compensate the sufferers so far as compensation is possible, and so punish the wrong-doers as to make them an everlasting example to evil-doers. In particular military commanders and other functionaries who were immediately responsible for these outrages against the elementary laws of humanity should be brought to trial as common criminals.

We have already referred to the question of the right of seizure of property at sea, but there is one branch of that question that demands some further notice. 'Men, boats and 'tackle employed in coast fisheries, and their cargoes of fresh 'fish, including fish kept alive by contrivances on the way to 'market' are immune from capture as enemies or enemies' property (though not on the ground of breach of blockade) so long as they are not engaged and are not likely to be engaged in any warlike employment. The rule is not limited to vessels fishing off their own coast. But it does not apply to 'great

'fishery' such as cod, sperm-whale, and seal. 'The condition 'that the fish must be brought to market alive appears,' says Dr. Westlake, 'to supply the necessary distinction.' The rule in this form is confirmed by the Hague Convention of 1907. The ninth Convention of 1907 declares (Article I.) that 'the bombardment by naval forces of ports, towns, villages, 'habitations or buildings which are not defended is prohibited,' but 'this prohibition does not include military works, military 'or naval establishments, stores of arms or of material of war, 'workshops or plants suitable to be used for the wants of the 'enemy fleet or army, or ships of war lying in the port,' and moreover undefended ports may be bombarded if the local authority refuse to supply on requisition necessary provisions for the wants of the fleet. But contributions in money may not be demanded at the cannon's mouth.

When we turn to actual fighting on the sea, certain very definite rules emerge. They are conveniently set forth in Lieutenant Hall's very useful work 'The Law of Naval Warfare.' Ships that fly a distinctive flag 'alone are entitled 'to attack the enemy, to exercise the right of visit and search 'or to take prizes.' No other ships are permitted to engage in acts of war. To use apparently neutral craft for the laying of mines is absolutely and notoriously illegal. The Declaration of Paris created in 1856 a rule that, in fact though not in name, is now universal: 'privateering is and remains abolished.' But the rule has to some extent been weakened by the legitimate practice of converting merchant ships into warships. Such converted ships, if legally converted, form part of the active fleet. But the conversion must not take place in neutral territorial waters. If it does, the ship may and should be treated as a pirate. Beyond this, England, the United States, Japan, and Italy forbid conversion on the High Seas, and England has reserved to herself the right to treat as she thinks fit vessels so converted. There can be little doubt that they should be treated as pirates, for if the principle of conversion on the High Seas is admitted, the ship in question can continually vary her 'state' and so possess a noteworthy characteristic of a pirate ship. Merchant ships may resist capture, and may be armed for this purpose, and in the course of resisting capture have all the rights of combatants provided that they conform to the rules of naval warfare.

The Hague Conference of 1907 expressed the wish that 'the 'Powers may apply, as far as possible, to war by sea, the 'principle of the Convention relative to the laws and customs 'of war on land,' and therefore, as Lieutenant Hall points out, at sea as on land 'the right of belligerents to adopt means of 'injuring the enemy is not unlimited.' Many of the restrictions mentioned above apply *ceteris paribus*. Thus 'nothing 'would justify the murder of prisoners or the continuing of 'firing upon a ship which has surrendered, and ceased to defend 'herself.' Firing under false colours is absolutely forbidden, and, as we have seen, bombardment of undefended places has no place, except in certain definite circumstances, in civilised warfare. 'Petty local Navigation,' 'Vessels charged 'with religious, scientific or philanthropic missions,' cartel ships, hospital ships, ships under license to trade are all exempt from capture. The convention of 1907 for the adaptation of the Geneva Convention to maritime warfare re-enacted a set of rules first adapted to naval warfare in 1868 and deals elaborately and humanely with the position of the sick and wounded. Neutral vessels may specially join in rescue work and in the care of the sick and wounded. Special provisions were also made in 1907 with respect to the use of submarine mines and torpedoes. Unanchored automatic contact mines are forbidden to be used unless they become harmless within one hour after control is lost. Anchored automatic contact mines are forbidden to be used unless they become harmless as soon as they have broken their moorings. 'It is forbidden to lay automatic contact mines 'off the coasts and ports of the enemy with the sole object 'of intercepting commercial shipping.' France and Germany have reserved their consent to this. There are also a number of provisions to safeguard peaceful shipping, but these are practically useless in the case of a savage and unscrupulous foe. Great Britain put forward the view that 'it should be pro-'hibited for belligerents to use unanchored mines at all and 'also anchored mines except in their or the enemy's territorial 'waters, and within ten miles of their fortified ports.' The whole question was to have been reopened this autumn at the Hague. It will doubtless be reopened with better effect a little later on.

Having now considered in some detail the working laws of

war, we turn to a question discussed by Dr. Westlake :—are the laws of war liable to be over-ridden by necessity? As is well known, English municipal law has never yielded to the temptation offered by this suggestion. In a famous murder trial,* certain seamen were tried on the charge of cannibalism at sea in an open boat. The defence was necessity. It was swept away with contempt, and the men were duly sentenced to death. It is obvious that, once such a defence to a breach of law is admitted, all law goes by the board. The adage that necessity knows no law is of no moral authority. To a free man there is no such thing as necessity. He must be willing to suffer rather than to disgrace himself. Necessity implies no alternative; but there is always the alternative of suffering or death. These things do not appeal to the modern German mind. Lueder tells us that the laws of war cease to be obligatory 'when the circumstances are such that 'the attainment of the object of the war and the escape from 'extreme danger would be hindered by observing the limitations 'imposed by the laws of war.' This is the argument, wrote Dr. Westlake in 1913, 'commonly given in Germany,' where jurists distinguish between Kriegsmanier (the ordinary laws of war) and Kriegsräson (the case of necessity). 'A maxim 'is current that *kriegsräson geht vor kriegsrecht* (it should 'be *vor kriegsmanier*) which we may translate "the reason of '"war over-rides its ordinary rules."' Dr. Westlake attacks the doctrine which he rightly regards as 'highly pernicious.' It is based upon the municipal doctrine that municipal criminal law ceases to be binding in cases of necessity, and by 'necessity' the German jurist means the necessity of victory: 'succeed—by war according to its laws, if you can—but, at 'all events and in any way, succeed.'

The doctrine laid down by Lueder is part of a whole philosophy of State life that is essentially immoral: the philosophy that in everything Might is Right and that the End justifies the Means. Clausewitz, who more than any other man is responsible for the horrors of to-day, tells us definitely

---

* *Queen* v. *Dudley & Stevens* (14 Q.B.D. 273). Sir James Fitzjames Stephen authorised the Court in this case to repudiate any inference from his writings that he held a contrary view. See also Westlake, 'International Law: Peace,' ed. 2, p. 310.

that 'War is only a continuation of State policy by other 'means.' If the necessity of national success demands war, war is the natural course, and if war arises in this 'natural' course it must be pursued so as to secure success regardless of all moral restraints. This was the theory, but probably no one (despite various ominous utterances by the Kaiser) believed it to be more than a philosophic theory of the State and of War, and none believed that Germany would throw to the winds her great moral position among the nations of the world.

So we come to the actual war that is now devastating Central and Western Europe. With the causes of the war it is not necessary now to deal, save to say this: that the German and English White Books and the speeches of the German Chancellor show clearly that the outbreak of the war exactly fitted in with the doctrine of necessity that German jurists had formulated, and the effect of which had been so entirely foreseen by Dr. Westlake, Lieutenant Hall, and others.

The immediate rupture between Germany and England is, however, directly pertinent to our theme. According to the rules of International Law a war between Germany and Belgium was impossible. A war may be a 'just' war, however unjust the motives that lie behind it, even as a marriage may be *justae nuptiae* however improper may be the real grounds of the marriage. But between certain persons there can be no marriage, however good the intention, and so between certain States there can be no war. War in the international sense could not take place between Germany and Belgium, for Prussia as long ago as 1831 had guaranteed in the most sacred fashion the independence and the immunity of Belgium from attack from any quarter. Again the philosophic theory of the 'necessity of success' was brought into operation. Germany, while formally admitting that she was breaking her most sacred obligations, poured her devastating armies into this guaranteed land. The demand for the free passage of German armies was one that Belgium as a guaranteed State had no power to grant. Germany in entering Belgium became not a 'just' belligerent, but a land-pirate.

The next point to be considered is the conduct of the German

campaign in Belgium. In considering this question we do not propose to rely on the evidence as to outrages committed by individual German soldiers or even small bodies of troops. For the moment we will brush aside individual outrages on women, children, and old men as the unauthorised acts of a flushed, savage, and often drunken soldiery. We prefer to take a larger issue. Belgium was ordered to allow the passage of German troops. She refused, and in strict accordance with her international position and her absolute international duty she at once offered at Liège and elsewhere such resistance as was in her power, and called upon her guarantors to help her. Her first resistance was overwhelmed by resistless weight of numbers, and then she was apparently summoned a second time to allow passage. Resistance to outrage did not cease and 'punishment' for having obeyed her strict statutory duties was inflicted. The 'punishment' consisted in an organised disregard of the laws of war set out above. The country was devastated; villages were reduced to ashes; non-combatants including many priests were shot without mercy; the Red Cross was not respected; the whole of a large area of Belgium was terrorised; Louvain, an undefended town considerably larger than Magdeburg, was sacked, officially sacked, numbers of the inhabitants slaughtered, further numbers sent to Germany under circumstances of cruelty and indignity that scarcely bear description, and the town was not accidentally, as in the case of Magdeburg, but deliberately, burnt and its University destroyed. Count zu Pappenheim described the destruction of Magdeburg as the most terrible visitation of God since the destruction of Jerusalem. The destruction of Louvain was far worse than that of Magdeburg.

Thirdly, the German commanders in the field have deliberately, and as part of an arranged plan of campaign, set aside the established rules of war. They have set to work to create general terror and distress. They have defied the opening provisions of the Convention of 1907, and have refused to recognise in the case of Belgium the town guards and other forces clearly covered by the terms of the Convention. We may point out that the German *Landwehr* cannot be recognised if the German practice of war is adopted. The German armies have enforced this breach of the Convention by an inconceivable series of outrages on a civil population whose right

'to carry arms openly' was specifically recognised by Germany in 1907. The behaviour of the German authorities in France has been disgraceful in the extreme. At Senlis and many other places they have defied with callous indifference every article of war, and their official manifestos to the inhabitants of towns on the subject of hostages show how little they care for the opinion of posterity. The German Government in their treatment of prisoners of war have outraged the consciences of mankind and have again deliberately infringed the Convention of 1907. The articles against pillage have been systematically violated. Pillage in the sense that the Germans exercise it had become so unknown in war that the term had ceased to be 'a term of art.' 'Back to Tilly' has been the cry of German kings, philosophers, and men. It measures the exact significance of what Professor Eucken, just before the war, called the 'soullessness' of modern German culture. The doctrine of 'War Treason' has been enforced with ruthless barbarity. It is a doctrine held by no civilised power. 'The 'honour and rights of the family' have been violated on a titanic scale. Money contributions have been levied, to the extent of enormous sums, in direct contravention of the Hague Convention. The destruction of fishing boats in the North Sea and the imprisonment of their crews is a notable instance of the reckless German defiance of law, for this rule of inviolability is almost prehistoric.

What is to be the end of these things; how is civilisation to reassert her control over the affairs of nations? We need not despair. The present war, despite the sorrows and miseries and crimes that it entails, is an event of supreme importance in the history of civilisation. If Germans could conduct war as they are conducting it, how then were they conducting peace, that peace the legitimate outcome of which, according to Clausewitz, is war? Men and nations do not become suddenly wicked. Temptation, says Thomas à Kempis, shows what men are. Modern German 'culture' and 'civilisation' were dangers to the whole world beside which this present manifestation of brutal war is small indeed. The corrupting influence of the universal German doctrines that Might is Right and that the End justifies the Means was not only eating out the soul of the great Germanic race but was, as Germanic influence, through commerce and literature, spread across the world, bound rapidly

to corrupt the other great races and specially the Slavonic and Anglo-Saxon peoples. Signs of such corruption are indeed not absent to-day. The belief in Might as the basis of Right was rapidly spreading when the war came. In ten years it might have been too late to save civilisation. If the world was affected for good by the schools of thought represented by Kant and Goethe, it was equally bound to be affected for evil by the intolerable doctrines of Nietzsche and Clausewitz, doctrines that have made German Protestantism bankrupt and sent the shudder of cynicism vibrating through the world. This cleansing war has, we believe, come in time to save not only Europe and America but the Germanic peoples. The war is cleansing because of its inevitable end. We do not doubt at all what the end will be, but we do ask ourselves, how shall we, when the end comes, reassert the authority of civilisation? Reprisals there cannot be. Restoration there can be, in money, and, in the case of Louvain, in manuscripts, books, and treasures drawn from German libraries and museums, as a compensation for rapine and pillage. Punishment there can be for individuals who are by a competent Court convicted of desecrating the sacred laws of humanity. The German military system and the German navy can be swept away, and if necessary the German Empire itself can be dissolved. There will be means, ample means, for punishing the nation that has forgotten God. But all this will go but a little way to reassert the authority of civilisation. The thinkers of Europe must combine to find some sanction for the principles of international law; must make it clear that civilisation does not ultimately rest upon Might but upon Right; must not retain expediency as the handmaid of high politics; must jointly and in some tremendous measure convert the weapons and finances of war into instruments of peace. In particular the dignity and authority of international law must be asserted by the setting up of a judicial tribunal to deal with the men responsible for the violation of Belgian neutrality. The invasion of Belgium was not an 'act 'of war' but a criminal act, and the nations of the world must devise means to bring the authors of such acts to trial and punishment.

THE GERMAN COLONIES

1. The Statesman's Yearbook. Macmillan. 1914.
2. Questions Diplomatiques et Coloniales, 1909–1913. Paris.
3. Koloniale Rundschau, 1909–1913. Berlin.
4. Die Deutschen Schützgebiete in Afrika und der Südsee, etc., 1909-1913. Berlin.
5. Mitteilungen des Seminärs für Afrikanischen und Ozeanischen Sprachen, 1900–1913. Berlin.

WHEN this war is brought to a close Germany will find that in provoking a war with Colonial expansion as its main motive she has sacrificed the substance for the shadow. Up till the 15th of August last, when Togoland fell, she possessed in Asia, Africa, and Oceania a Colonial Empire and spheres of influence—areas of special privilege—covering 1,484,944 square miles.* She was regarded as the dominant Power in European Turkey, and, except in Armenia, her influence was pre-eminent throughout Asia Minor, and also at Antioch, Aleppo, Skanderūn, and on the Euphrates and the Tigris. Her ally Austria had a semi-protectorate over Albania, with the right to maintain there as sovereign a Prussian Prince. In northern China Germany ruled and administered 400 square miles, and enjoyed monopolist concessions over the whole province of Shan Tung. She possessed the Mariana and Caroline Archipelagos and 70,000 square miles of north-east New Guinea, together with the Bismarck Archipelago (20,000 square miles), and the northern Solomon Islands (4200 square miles). In the long-coveted archipelago of Samoa she possessed nine islands and islets out of fourteen. In Africa she controlled 1,032,280 square miles, namely 291,950 square miles in the Kamerun (including more than 100,000 square miles obtained from France in 1911), 33,700 square miles in Togoland (a possession wedged in between the British Gold Coast and French Dahomey), 384,180 square

* 1,128,640 square miles in 1913.

miles in German East Africa, and 322,450 square miles in German South-West Africa.

In addition to these actual possessions she had recently obtained from Great Britain public or private acknowledgments of her special commercial—and it may be political—interest in a large portion of the Portuguese African possessions, and an admission that she was a fourth party with co-equal interests in the affairs of Liberia.* Further, Sir Edward Grey had stated publicly that any schemes of German aggrandisement in the Congo Basin, provided they did not interfere with the vested British interests in the south of that region, or did not involve aggression against other Powers, would not be opposed by the British Empire. In short, Germany, joined with her confederate Austria, was in a very fair way towards building up a German Overseas Empire, which, combined with spheres of influence in Africa, the Near East, and the Far East, might have aggregated a total area of 2,000,000 square miles of highly productive lands reserved for Austro-German exploitation, reservoirs of raw products for German industries, markets for the purchase of German wares.

Nor was this the end of Germany's opportunities of expansion. For twenty or thirty years she had been permeating Belgium with her capital, her enterprise, and her racial influence; and slowly winning over a party in Holland to the toleration of a close alliance, if not a fusion, with the German Empire. The German colonisation of Brazil was proceeding apace, and German interests in tropical America generally made a good third after those of Great Britain and the United States. It was only in the Near East that her expansionist schemes had sustained a check. This occurred in the years 1911 to 1913. In the first place, Italy, alarmed at the well-founded report of German designs on Tripoli,† made use of grievances which Turkish policy fatuously supplied and took possession of all that portion of North Africa unclaimed

---

* Where, by-the-bye, her newly founded cable and wireless stations have been a menace to British ships in the Atlantic.

† An Austro-German Chartered Company was being promoted to which an immense concession was to be granted by the Porte over Tripoli and Barka.

by France in Tunis and England in Egypt. This action not only entailed the break-up of the Triple Alliance, but it placed Germany in a peculiar dilemma; for when Turkey appealed to her for help she found herself impotent. She could not strike at Italy without injuring herself and Austria, and had to stand by in angry silence whilst Italy took possession not only of Tripoli and Barka but also of Rhodes and the Dodecanese, and proceeded to demand a share in the development of southern Asia Minor. That was only the beginning of the trouble, for Italy, in order to overcome Turkish resistance in North Africa, roused Greece; and Greece (who had been perpetually frustrated in her ambitions by German intervention) organised the Balkan Alliance. The ensuing Balkan war reduced Turkey in Europe to an area of about 10,800 square miles, and interposed between Austria-Hungary and Constantinople a formidable barrier of warlike peoples.

The irritation of Germany was only partly appeased by the international recognition of her privileged position in what remained of Turkey. She obtained the command of the Turkish army, and the control of the Baghdad Railway and all that depended thereon. She had, it is true, from money market considerations, to accord an unwilling recognition to French concessions in Syria and to Russo-French interests in Armenia. But it was understood that she had come to terms with England, and had virtually been able to carry her influence not merely to Baghdad, but to Basra, within sight of the Persian Gulf.

Still there remained the Balkan obstacle. The two years of Balkan warfare had effectively shut out the Dual Alliance from Salonika, the goal aimed at for more than thirty years. Salonika itself had become Greek; while Servia and Montenegro covered all the long range of territory that separated the Austrian dominions from even the vicinity of the great Aegean harbour. Servia, in fact, was now the barrier between Berlin and the Byzantine Crown—Berlin, because to all intents and purposes Austria had become once again a subordinate German State with an unwilling Hungary in tow. The Dual Alliance had counted on quite a different issue from the first Balkan War. It had anticipated a victory for the Turkish army, reorganised by German officers. Austria would then intervene, expel the Turks, and become mistress of the

Balkan peninsula, caretaker for Germany; the interests of the two Empires being virtually fused in a dual rule of Hohenzollern and Hapsburg.

The issue of the Balkan War destroyed these dreams. Servia had found herself. From being the cowardly, ill-organised, semi-barbaric kingdom of 1885, which in virtual alliance with Austria had attempted to reduce Bulgaria to impotence and subjection, she had become a warlike nation of brave and resourceful soldiers. Conscious—super-conscious, perhaps—of the great destiny that was opening before her, she made no attempt to conceal her dislike and suspicion of Austria-Hungary. Her dread of an Austro-Hungarian attack, so keenly felt and resented in 1909, induced her to stir up trouble against her huge enemy by intrigues in Bosnia. To what extent her Government was really culpable in planning the assassination of the heir to the Austro-Hungarian Crown is now a matter of considerable doubt, for it appears that the actual assassins were Austro-Hungarian subjects. But the crime of June last gave Germany (above all) and Austria (less willingly) the opening for which they had been in search: the *casus belli* with Servia which should lead first to Salonika and next to Constantinople.

Russia was keenly alive to the consequences of a Servian defeat. If Germany and Austria reduced Servia to the position of a tutelary State, their armies would be able to reach the Aegean and the Dardanelles, and Russia's main maritime outlet, the Black Sea, would then be completely at the mercy of a Power at least as strong as herself. Therefore Russia resolved to stand by Servia, at any rate to the extent of preventing her loss of independence, though not of forbidding punishment if her complicity in the Sarajevo assassinations were proved.

Many of us in this country did not look at the problem at all through Russian eyes or sympathise overmuch with Russian fears. We felt that great empires like Germany and Austria ought to have an adequate outlet for their energies and commerce. We should have much regretted the destruction of Servian independence, and perhaps have resented actively any attack on Greece. But the question of supremacy in the Balkan peninsula was one, we thought, which might be safely left to be fought out diplomatically or otherwise between Austria-Germany on the one hand and Russia on the other.

But Germany realised that war with Russia meant war with France, and as she believed France to be by far the weaker and more vulnerable of the two, she decided with characteristic brutality to attack and ruin France by one supreme effort of her army and to do so by way of Belgium. She would next turn on Russia with the Austrian and Hungarian armies, drive her out of Poland, recreate a Polish State in a modified form as a barrier to Orthodox Russia, and then as soon as possible convert her sphere of influence in Turkey into a protectorate under which the Turkish Sultanate would have been reduced more or less to a transparency.

Germany may have momentarily meant what she said, when she asserted that after the war was over she would evacuate Belgium and Luxembourg and annex no more French territory in Europe. But in nations as in individuals the appetite grows with eating. If Great Britain had remained neutral it is highly improbable that a victorious Germany, even after she had obtained full satisfaction in the Balkan Peninsula, would have left France and Belgium intact. The immense temptation of a coast-line facing Essex, Kent, and Sussex would have kept her garrisons in Flanders and Picardy. She would have opposed Great Britain with a *fait accompli*; and, secure from any counter-attack on the part of France or Belgium, have dared us to turn her out. Indeed it is probable that the bluster against Russia was a mere blind; and Germany in preparing for this colossal struggle had staked her all on the conquest of Belgium and Picardy, had aimed at Great Britain from the very first, and resolved to win for herself not only a vast empire over south-east Europe and western Asia, but also a commercial and naval foothold on the coasts of the North Sea and the English Channel.

It is worth while here to record some of the alternative plans which during the past few years have crept timidly into print in a few German pamphlets, but were more often set forth verbally when far-sighted Germans came to talk with friendly Englishmen. The writer of this article has been a great deal in Germany since 1909, and has not hesitated to put on paper opinions expressed to him by German statesmen, diplomatists, commercial magnates, and others; even, he may venture to say, by one or two of the enlightened Princes of Southern Germany. These ideas were set forth in his book published more than

a year ago, 'Common Sense and Foreign Policy.' In this work were outlined the plans for securing a considerable outlet for German ambitions without the costly and horrible appeal to the cannon and the mine. It was believed that by restoring to France Metz and the small area of French-speaking Lorraine, and by extruding the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg from the German Customs Union, Germany might win France from her Russian alliance and secure an amiable British neutrality by this palpable evidence of her resolve to respect Belgian independence and neutrality. Nor was it altogether certain that Russia might not be won over to acquiescence in Austro-German expansion, if Ruthenia were given to Russia in exchange for a strip of Bessarabia (which would give Hungary a maritime outlet to the Black Sea, in consolation for losing to Austria her Slav provinces), and if Galicia were added to Russian Poland; while in addition Russia would acquire Trebizond and an enclave at Skutari opposite Constantinople. Public opinion in England was further to be conciliated by the restoration to Denmark of the small district of Hadersleben in North Slesvig.

But these and similar plans for the placation of Germany's neighbours were so angrily received in Berlin that the leading German newspapers were forbidden to review any book or article which contained them.* In a word Germany decided to give up nothing and to fight for everything. After mobilisation she forgot almost to mention the Servian question, and admitted that as the result of a successful war she intended to claim the French Colonies. She actually believed for a few days after the die was cast that she would emerge from this adventure, not only retaining all her present possessions, but having acquired the overlordship of the Balkan Peninsula, Asia Minor, and Mesopotamia, all, or nearly all, French Africa, and possibly French Indo-China.

---

* The substance of the book above referred to was delivered in the form of lectures in Germany or before the German Colonial Society in London; and a considerable section of German opinion warmly approved of its proposals. When the lectures were being prepared for publication in book form the leading German newspapers asked for review copies, only to find they were forbidden to review it 'on account of the proposed retrocession of Metz.'

That this dream will not be realised is now sufficiently clear. Instead we have to ask what is to happen to the German Colonies. As some compensation for our losses in men and money we and our allies are entitled as speedily as possible to possess ourselves of the whole of the German overseas dominions. They may indeed prove to be the only German asset out of which we can to some extent recoup ourselves and our allies for the appalling sacrifice of life and wealth caused by this war—wealth in property, wealth in storied beauty and the achievements of the art of bygone times. The compensation is inadequate, but by no means despicable. Several of the German Colonies are already in British possession, while Togoland is in the joint occupation of England and France. The vast territory of the Kamerun will probably be similarly secured by a joint Anglo-French attack from the north, from the south and from the west. Here there will only be at most a thousand white officers and officials, and their black troops will find the racial affinity of the negro and negroid soldiers marching under the British and French flags too strong an appeal to resist. Sultan after sultan, chief after chief, will probably desert the German cause. On the coast-line of the Cameroons * (as we used to call it) there are still natives who were educated by British missionaries down to the middle of the 'eighties, who can read and write English and who remember that for a brief period they were actually British subjects; for it must be recalled that we annexed all of the northern coast-line of the Cameroons in 1884–5 and only surrendered it to Germany from a desire not to play the dog in the manger.† So deep was the impression made by the Baptist missionaries and British traders that to this day English is a more common language of intercommunication between Europeans and natives in the coast region of the Cameroons than German. This great territory of the Kamerun will be divided between British Nigeria and French Congo in more or less equal proportions, and the people of the western coastlands

* The name is really the Portuguese 'Camarões.'

† The writer of this article for some two years—1885–7—administered the little territory of Ambas Bay on the flanks of the mighty Cameroons volcano.

will return delightedly to that British rule, for which they openly petitioned in 1882–3.

German South-West Africa must inevitably become British. There are numerous German mission stations which we shall regard with mixed feelings: sympathetically because they have done so much to bring peace and civilisation and a workable form of Christianity to the Hottentots and Bantu negroes of this region; and unsympathetically because, though these very missions originally entered the country in the early part of the nineteenth century supported by British subscriptions and backed by British encouragement (with the result that not a few of their members became British South African subjects), it was the German missionaries who encouraged the German Government to intervene in South-West Africa and to obtrude a foreign dominion into what should in course of time have become one great confederation of English-speaking States—the United States of South Africa. Unquestionably the seventy thousand Damara and Ovampo negroes will long for and work for British success; while the remnant of the Hottentots in the south can scarcely restrain their smouldering animosity against the Germans who waged a pitiless warfare against them between 1894 and 1904. A great deal of this region is at present arid desert, so that the movements of the 16,000 (some say 30,000 owing to recent reinforcements) German soldiers and colonists, and equally those of any invading British forces, will be hampered by lack of water, forage, and food supplies.

The disposal of German South-West Africa is a question that will require both tact and firmness in its solution. Even in the stress of the gravest national danger which has beset Great Britain since Napoleon established his camp at Boulogne, we must not forget the imperial problems awaiting solution, and one of these is the native question in South Africa. At the present time it would not be advisable unduly to increase the area under the Union Government of South Africa where it embraces a large native population. The British and the Dutch colonists of temperate South Africa are unwilling to concede to their black and brown fellow-countrymen that equality before the law which England with her larger imperial experience regards as the necessary basis of peaceful government. Therefore, it is inadvisable that the Imperial Govern-

ment should entrust the whole of Africa south of the Congo basin to one centralised colonial government. The result would certainly be great disaffection amongst the millions of negroes, to be followed by disastrous racial wars. Among the negroes of South Africa the direct rule or control of British officials is unquestionably far more popular than the rule of the Union Government. The British South Africa Chartered Company, though its first few years were marked by harsh and unfair treatment of the natives, has gradually acquired the statesmanship of the East India Company, especially in dealing with the more densely populated negro territories of the Zambezi basin. The direct British control over Bechuanaland, Basutoland, Swaziland and Nyasaland is notoriously popular with the people, who are contented with things as they are, and whose rights and privileges are jealously preserved. This must be borne in mind therefore in our ultimate disposal of German South-West Africa, the more 'negro' portions of which—Ovampoland and Northern Damaraland—should, at any rate for the present, either be governed by the Administrator of Rhodesia or by some other British official appointed from London.

German East Africa must likewise be conquered from the Germans and must pass under British control. It will—to our great and legitimate delight—supply at last the missing link in the Imperial chain 'from the Cape to Cairo.' This conception, which Cecil Rhodes so greatly popularised, was first imagined and adumbrated by the late Sir Edwin Arnold in 1876. It was cherished by Sir Richard Burton, by Colonel J. A. Grant, by Sir John Kirk, and by many a missionary toiling early in Nyasaland, on Tanganyika, or on the Victoria Nyanza. From all of these the present writer gathered inspiration and to this ideal he devoted his journeys in 1884 and in 1889–91. He may be permitted to record that he first hoisted the British flag on and near Kilimanjaro, and was likewise the principal agent in bringing under British protection the region between the Zambezi on the south and the north end of Tanganyika on the north, as well as other territories. The British flag was withdrawn from Kilimanjaro to gratify the Emperor William, who coveted the possession of the highest mountain in Africa. In the same spirit and with the desire to satisfy German aspirations as far as possible

and thereby deprive Germany of any excuse for hostility, open or concealed, towards us, England surrendered to Germany large portions of East Africa which had been originally brought under British influence, and which voluntarily offered to accept British government or control, although the Germans often had no preceding claim founded on exploration, trade, or influence. It is only right, therefore, that suffering as we have had to suffer for this war forced upon us—a war in which even our national existence is imperilled—we should, as victors in the struggle, assume or reassume control over the whole of German East Africa.

The claim of Australia to German New Guinea is one which we could not resist even if we desired to do so. Probably New Zealand will expect to retain under her dominion the Samoan Archipelago. The large islands of the Bismarck Archipelago and the northern Solomon Islands may perhaps preferably be ruled—at any rate for a time—directly by Great Britain, under her Commissionership of the Western Pacific. Our officers are already administering the affairs of the greater part of the Solomon Archipelago, and would find it easy to extend their sway over the other adjoining islands, which should be once more named (as they were by their original discoverer Captain Cook) 'New Britain' and 'New Ireland.' In the same way direct British government would be preferable in the Caroline and Mariana Archipelagos. Japan for a time will take over the leasehold of Kiao Chao. She has, however, voluntarily stated her intention of restoring it eventually to China, a proposition which we can well leave to the great East Asiatic Empires to settle between themselves. In no case would it be made over to any European State; and certainly neither Japan nor China would tolerate its restoration to Germany, who has made herself thoroughly disliked by both these East Asiatic Powers.

Thus the German Colonial Empire would pass away from under the German flag to that of Britain or of her daughter nations, or to that of France. Russia, if we emerge victorious from this struggle, will, in addition to whatever else she may demand, expect the cancellation of all railway and port concessions granted to Germany throughout the Turkish Empire, and in particular the transference to herself of the port and railway concessions of the Gulf of Skanderūn, so that there may

possibly come into existence a Russian Mediterranean port opposite to Cyprus. Of late there have been foolish suggestions in the press on the part of people quite unacquainted with the politics of the Mediterranean, urging Great Britain in return for a Greek alliance to surrender the island of Cyprus to Greece! This is not to be thought of for a moment. It is more than ever necessary to the welfare of the British Empire that Cyprus should remain in British possession. Its present Greek population is usually exaggerated,* and will be balanced as time goes on and perhaps exceeded by elements that are not Greek. Italy will similarly retain Rhodes, whether or not she disposes of the Dodecanese to Greece. It is well that Italy should be represented in the development of the Levant, and she may find a sphere of operations by agreement with Russia and France in South-Western Asia Minor. As the years go by the French influence over Syria will be ever more clearly defined till it results in an actual protectorate; and the defeat of Germany will assist to bring this about, for it will withdraw all political support from the not very prosperous German colony of Haifa, and the ambitious schemes † for Germanising Jerusalem.

In one way and another, therefore, the Allies may hope through the confiscation of German colonies and German overseas concessions and privileges to get back a portion—but only a portion ‡—of the frightful losses inflicted upon them by the ambition of Germany. German South-West Africa will prove in course of time a most valuable possession, with its minerals and its tracts of healthy, temperate mountain country, sufficiently well watered to nourish a vigorous European or negro population. The Kamerun will probably be found to possess tin, like the tin of Nigeria. Its coast regions are also exceedingly rich in rubber, timber, and that factor of ever-increasing importance, palm-oil. Togoland on account

---

* It was 214,480 in 1911.

† Set forth in a very illuminating way recently in the weekly review, the 'Near East.'

‡ Capitalised in a rough and ready fashion, the value of the German Empire across the seas would not amount to more than fifty millions sterling. But a hundred millions of pounds at least would be required to make good what has been destroyed by German soldiers in Belgium alone.

of its palm-oil and its numerous tropical products is almost as valuable as the Gold Coast. German East Africa, as we at present know it, is not so attractive as the other African investments of the German Empire. Its territories are as a rule more unhealthy than those of South-West Africa and those of the Kamerun or Togoland, yet it does possess in the north of Nyasaland one of those splendid tracts of fertile, well-watered and absolutely healthy country which have been amongst the wonders revealed within the last fifty years' exploration of the Dark Continent. Here there are mountain peaks reaching to 10,000 feet in altitude and districts very sparsely populated which are as well suited to European colonisation as so much of British East Africa and Nyasaland has proved to be. A great deal of valuable tropical produce can be garnered along the shores of the great Tanganyika Lake and transported to the coast on the recently completed Tanganyika Railway, which of itself represents an outlay of nine or ten millions sterling and taps for maritime transport all the eastern part of the Congo basin. In addition there are indications of the existence of coal, diamonds, gold, and possibly copper. German East Africa is also admirably adapted to growing on a large scale cereals like maize and rice, and is capable of sustaining a very large negro population. Huge tracts of land at present almost depopulated, owing to the former ravages of the slave trade and other causes, would be well suited for Indian settlement. East Africa has been described as the America of the Hindu, and the phrase is more applicable to German than to British East Africa. The first use of the phrase was probably due to Sir John Kirk, who strove for twenty years to bring this vast region under the control of the British Empire. There is already a very considerable Indian population along the whole coast belt of German East Africa. In view of the loyalty which India has displayed in this grave crisis in the history of the British Empire, whatever dispositions take place in regard to German East Africa, it is to be hoped that the claims of India for an outlet may here be satisfied, especially as the advent of Indians would be far more suited to the general climate of the region and much more welcome to the negro population than ambitious schemes of European colonisation. The area under the Government of Uganda might well be extended by the inclusion of the territory which

lies between the north end of Tanganyika and the south west corner of the Victoria Nyanza, while British East Africa might bring within its boundary that Kilimanjaro region which for a brief time formed part of the East African concessions that the present writer obtained in 1884. The whole of the north end of Lake Nyasa (including the mountain region above referred to) should be added to British Nyasaland ; but with these exceptions German East Africa should be a separate entity under British administration, and might be renamed ' Zanzibar ' and be governed from the Island of Zanzibar.

What account has Germany to give of her stewardship, of her thirty years as a Colonial Power ? On the whole a good one. International Science has been greatly the gainer by the presence of Germany as a ruler or administrator in Africa, Oceania, China, and the Turkish Empire. Look at the magnificently furnished German museums of ethnology and natural history ; consider the German contributions to philology, to the study of tropical diseases, to economic botany, chemistry, palaeontology, history, and archaeology. Germany has effectively abolished the deeply rooted slave-trade in East Africa and in the Kamerun hinterland. Her treatment of the native races in some parts of Africa has been harsh, but on the whole—when unprejudiced truth is told—the natives are the better in the long run for the incoming of the German. In South-West Africa the negro population has diminished through the long-drawn out wars with the white rulers ; but it must be remembered when the Germans first came on the scene in 1884 the Hottentots were exterminating the Bantu negroes, yet perishing themselves from alcohol, small-pox, syphilis, and starvation due to disappearance of the big game. Of late years the native population in South-West Africa has been on the increase. In East Africa thirty years of German rule has probably doubled the negro population. Germany has constructed a thousand miles of railroad in East Africa, 1880 miles in South-West Africa, 128 miles in Togoland, 149 miles in the Kamerun, and 272 miles in Kiao Chau (Eastern China). In the Near East she has built the famous Baghdad railway from Konieh nearly to Skanderūn and Aleppo and, in patches, onwards towards Baghdad (some 1200 miles in all). Her future policy in Turkey might have tended to secure unfair preference for German trade ; yet

it is only fair to remember that in the territories actually under German sway she has preserved the Free Trade principle. Her own trade, import and export, with the entirety of her oversea possessions has scarcely reached to an annual value of five and a half millions sterling. The import and export trade of the British Empire with these German Colonies is about one million pounds in annual value. In short, though Germany has made no great profit so far from her overseas Empire, she as a colonising Power has deserved well of the world at large; which is one among many reasons for regretting her present outbreak of unreasoning ferocity, much as one would deplore the criminal lunacy of a near relative or an esteemed neighbour.

It is interesting to note that not only does Germany so far do but a small trade with her Colonies, but that there are only 23,383 Germans in 'Greater Germany,' as against 243,000 Germans settled in lands under the British Crown, including 100,000 in the United Kingdom prior to the outbreak of war. Germans will always be welcomed as colonists in the lands across the seas, for they are the best type of settler that any European nation can desire within its territories, especially if they be under a more liberal form of government than their home administration. Germans have played a most considerable and never sufficiently recognised part in the foundation and the development of the British Empire, in the development of French North Africa, in the development of the United States, and of Spanish America. Was it not the Hamburg firm of Godeffroi that founded the commerce of the Pacific? Was it not German colonists (sent thither by Charles V.) who first revealed the geography and the great mineral wealth of northern South America? Did not a German accompany as first assistant Alexander Mackenzie in his epoch-making journey to the Canadian Pacific coast and to the Antarctic Ocean? German names stand out in connexion with great achievements in New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, Nigeria, Congoland, East Africa, British Guiana, India, and the Himalayas. It is true that these German pioneers were for the most part employed by the British Government, but they brought their German patience, their German thoroughness, their scientific accuracy, their cheery endurement of hardships, their frugality, to the

foundations of these white men's colonies or white men's protectorates. If we must remember Louvain and all the horrors that have attended the German invasion of Belgium, if we must recall the German attempts to raise the Muhammadan world against the Western Powers of Europe—and for the sake of our national safety we shall be compelled for generations to come not to forget these incidents—we must at the same time bear in mind the splendid qualities of the German people, especially evinced before the German empire was established in 1871. As some set-off against the re-distribution of the German colonial possessions and spheres of influence, there must be a pledge, written or unwritten, some instinctive determination on the part of the Powers profiting by this re-allotment, that they will establish in their new dominions no differential treatment for commerce ; that trade and industry in those regions shall once again be as open to German enterprise as to that of the subjects of Great Britain, Russia, Belgium, or France. In that way and along these lines the nations whom Germany has wronged can safely concede to her ' a place in the sun ' and permit her to recover from the frightful damage which she too has suffered through the insensate ambition, the cruelty and the duplicity of the Prussian dynasty. Before long it is to be hoped that the Hohenzollerns may cease to be the ruling house in the German Empire. Rid of them and of Prussian Junkerdom, Germany will be able to recover from her war wounds and her money losses. No longer suspected or dreaded as the preparers of sudden invasions, ' frightful examples,' treaty repudiations and ' Holy wars,' Germans will be welcomed everywhere for their innate abilities, their commercial aptitude, their scientific acumen. Fortunate will be the European nation (once they are deprussianised) that can attract them in large numbers as colonists, as instructors in many arts and crafts, or as traders and mariners. Germany will play as important a part as ever in the development of the world, but it will be as a collaborator with the other peoples of Europe, Asia, and Africa ; not as their despot and taskmaster.

H. H. Johnston.

WAR AND LITERATURE

WAR is the great scavenger of thought. It is the sovereign disinfectant, and its red stream of blood is the Condy's Fluid that cleans out the stagnant pools and clotted channels of the intellect. I suppose that hardly any Englishman who is capable of a renovation of the mind has failed to feel during the last few weeks a certain solemn refreshment of the spirit, a humble and mournful consciousness that his ideals, his aims, his hopes during our late past years of luxury and peace have been founded on a misconception of our aims as a nation, of our right to possess a leading place in the sunlighted spaces of the world. We have awakened from an opium-dream of comfort, of ease, of that miserable poltroonery of 'the sheltered life.' Our wish for indulgence of every sort, our laxity of manners, our wretched sensitiveness to personal inconvenience, these are suddenly lifted before us in their true guise as the spectres of national decay; and we have risen from the lethargy of our dilettantism to lay them, before it is too late, by the flashing of the unsheathed sword. 'Slaughter is God's daughter,' a poet said a hundred years ago, and that strange phrase of Coleridge's, which has been so often ridiculed by a slothful generation, takes a new and solemn significance to ears and eyes awakened at last by the strong red glare of reality.

But it is impossible, after recovery from the first violent shock to our attention, that we should be able to preserve a philosophical attitude in daily life. United as we happily are, purified as our large conceptions of duty must become under the winnowing fan of danger, it is scarcely within the power of those of us who do not enjoy the signal privilege, the envied consecration, of actual fighting,—it is hard for those who are spectators, however strenuously set in heart to share the toils and sufferings of their luckier and younger brethren,—not to turn, by instinct, to the order of ideas with which we are, or until now have been, each one of us, particularly engaged. The artist cannot help considering how the duration of war will affect the production and the appreciation of pictures and

statues and music, since, however wide and deep the desecration of harmony may go, these things must eventually rise again and reappear above the welter. The man of science has to put his investigations and his experiments on one side, yet the habit of his brain is too ingrained to enable him to forget the relations of knowledge to life, or to lose the conviction that scientific development must proceed the moment that the arresting violence of war is relaxed. And the lover or student of pure literature needs accuse himself of no levity if his mind, also, strains forward with anxiety, and compares with our own cataclysm the catastrophes of former times. The present pages will contain some observations, not on what is called 'the literature of war,' but on the effect of war upon the lives of men of letters.

At the outset of the great contest, the attention of all civilised nations was fixed upon the martyrdom of Belgium, and the destruction of her premier university by the impious Uhlans gave the sympathy of the world a special acuteness. A sort of spasm of rage passed through the hearts of all cultivated persons at the news, at first received with utter incredulity, but soon confirmed, of the wanton sack of Louvain. From the purely educational point of view, though the anger caused by this act could not be excessive, the regret might be. The English and French newspapers, in their righteous indignation, spoke of Louvain as they might of Oxford or Paris. But, for eighty years past Louvain has not been one of the State universities of Belgium; its educational importance has not approached, nor been on the same lines as, that of Ghent, or even of Brussels. Louvain, which in the later Middle Ages was the centre of Flemish learning, has never really recovered from the fate which befell it at the close of the eighteenth century. It has been carried on unofficially, as a Catholic centre of teaching, by the personal efforts of the bishops, although it is true that in comparatively recent years other faculties than that of theology have been represented in it. The real horror of the crime at Louvain was æsthetic rather than educational. The library was far richer than the newspapers have reported; the burning of its MSS. —they included, I believe, an inedited correspondence of Erasmus—permanently impoverishes the history of the country. Of the artistic value of the buildings destroyed—the

Church of St. Pierre, the Clothmakers' Halles of 1317—the only consolation we can have is to know that these glorious relics were already very largely 'restored.' So far as pictures are concerned, one of the most important early Flemish masters, Dierik Bouts, seems to be almost wiped out. A circumstance which should not be overlooked, surely, is that these outrages on history and art were perpetrated, not by ignorant savages, but by highly educated officers amply instructed in the spiritual value of the objects which they sacrificed to their vanity and frenzy.

But, however deeply we regret the abominable destruction of works of art, the paralysis of living intelligence is an even more serious matter. For a long while past the astonishing development of the Belgian mind, as displayed in a triple literature, has been watched in Germany, and noted by German professors, with patronising envy. It has been observed, first with surprise and then with annoyance, that a little country no larger than a Teutonic province, tucked into a corner between the sea and two Great Powers, a country without a dominant language, without a decisive capital, a mere political expression, has since 1880 ventured to display, in defiance of the menacing shadow of Germany, an intellectual activity, French, Flemish, and Walloon, in which German *kultur* has found no place. It has not been agreeable to the professors of Berlin to be obliged to admit that the greatest poet of Europe at the opening of the twentieth century is unquestionably the noble Emile Verhaeren, a Fleming of the Antwerp district, writing consistently in French. It has not been to their taste to watch the advance of Maeterlinck, of Camille Lemonnier, of Eugène Demolder, writing in French or of the less known and perhaps less brilliant, but numerous and enthusiastic, new school of authors, composing ardently in Flemish and even to some extent in Walloon.

This is an aspect of the war which, in our natural absorption in vaster interests and more directly material features, has not yet received attention in England. So lately as 1868, Taine, in a survey of intellectual conditions in the Low Countries, remarked with regret of the Flemings that 'ils ne peuvent 'citer de ces esprits créateurs qui ouvrent sur le monde de 'grandes vues originales, ou enchâssent leurs conceptions dans 'de belles formes capables d'un ascendant universel.' This was

perfectly true before the great war of 1870; it was still true a decade later. But about the year 1880 a most remarkable effort was made by Belgium to redeem her peoples from intellectual sterility, and since that time no country of Europe has come forward in literature so rapidly as she. A generation, joyously greeted at home as 'La Jeune Belgique,' stimulated by the ideas which were stirred in close spectators of the last great war, yet protected, in a highly prosperous country, from the actual miseries and denudations of that struggle, dared to inaugurate a literary revolution against the cut-and-dried theories of their elders, and found for the first time a fitting expression in verse and prose for the rich, full-blooded, highly coloured genius of Flemish life. In this movement, encouraged by the praise of Paris, undeterred by the sneers of Berlin, the pioneers were Max Waller, who died prematurely in 1889, and the admirable poet of Louvain, Albert Giraud, of whom I know not whether he is alive or dead. This exuberant school of writers, now as broad as Rubens in their joyous painting of life, now as exquisite as the traceries of their medieval architecture, has been, up to this summer, producing abundant work of a kind not exactly paralleled in any other country. In the matter of speech, of course, the possession of a single language has been denied to the Belgians. Their poets and novelists have to take their choice between a tongue which is shared with French or one which is almost identical with Dutch. But their genius, taking different manifestations from individual minds, is yet national and peculiar to Belgium. It has been observed that the greatest Belgian writers of to-day are Flemings by birth, education and character; and even Maeterlinck, who has long inhabited France, alternately residing in Normandy and in Provence, is still a pure Fleming of Ghent in his dramas. There is no modern writer more national than Verhaeren, and to study his poems is to gain such an impression of 'Toute la Flandre' as is to be found nowhere else. It should be interesting to note that when, in 1881, the 'Jeunes Belges,' in a now-famous manifesto, announced their intention of creating a national literature, they were met with coarse ridicule in Germany, and recommended to stick to the prosy business of their trades. They did not heed the warning, and in thirty years they have enriched their country with a fine harvest of masterpieces.

This literature of Belgium has now been trodden into the mud by the jack-boot of the Prussian. Let us not forget, in our legitimate indignation at the destruction of medieval relics, that Germany has committed in Belgium—to speak for the moment only of Belgium—a still greater crime against light and learning. We have to consider the conditions of mental life in this gallant and unfortunate country. It is a commonplace to say that Belgium is the battle-field of Europe; it is more, it is the grave-yard of successive generations of Flemish aspiration. Since the sixteenth century, when its earliest civilisation was withered by the agitations of the Spanish invader, until the close of the war of 1870, when the assurance of its neutrality gave it at last a basis of hope and energy, Belgium never had breathing space. Sacked by the armies of Louis XIV., flung by the Treaty of Utrecht on to the pikes of Austria, overrun and annexed by the French in 1795, torn and tortured by European diplomacy in the days of Waterloo, not given, until 1830, even the shadow of individual sovereignty, the insecurity of existence in Flanders and Brabant through all these centuries could but detach the minds of men from the creation of works of the imagination. Who writes great poems when the spectres of famine and fire are prowling round his homestead? After the last war all this was ended, as the Belgians thought, as all the rest of Europe, with one sinister exception, believed. The neutrality of Belgium, solemnly re-asserted and confirmed, was a sacred basis for the intellectual life of the little admirable country to build upon. She was no longer so fragile, no longer so timorous, and she builded the beautiful structure which Germany has now cynically and brutally destroyed.

When we turn to the contemplation of our beloved France, we have not, we can never have, to endure so lamentable a catastrophe. However sorely tried, the genius of the French must recover from its momentary misfortunes, since it is an essential portion of the spiritual wealth of the world. As I write these pages, in the nightmare of events, with the reverberations of the combat stunning the sense by their rapid and violent development, I cannot tell how the fortunes of France may have brightened or darkened before this 'Review' finds a reader. Much must be lost before anything is gained, and we must harden ourselves to remember with equanimity, what the

Spanish proverb tells us, that often the best of acorns is munched by the worst of swine. But of the ultimate salvation of the genius of France, he would be a cowardly pessimist who should doubt for a moment. If the lovely provinces from Dunkirk to St. Jean de Luz, from Brest to Menton, were wholly overrun by barbarians, if everything we have honoured and delighted in were obscured, and if the lamp lay shattered in the dust, still the world would not despair for France. In the last hour the horn of Roland must sound from the dark gorge of Roncevaux, and angels must descend from heaven with vengeance against the enemies of France and of God. In these dreadful times, we may keep our spirits up by reading the 'Chanson 'de Roland' once again.

But, for the moment, the splendid activity of the literature of France is at a standstill. It is poignant and yet irresistible to turn over the last books which came from Paris in those final weeks of July, books that fluttered on to one's table like unsuspecting sulphur-coloured butterflies fallen from a soft blue summer sky. I give myself the sad pleasure of naming the latest that came, and I cannot, in this emotional crisis, adopt the publicist's high impartiality. They are all the books of friends, of old and valued friends, workers serene and busy in their distinguished environment when July ended, and now out of our touch and knowledge, vanished from the sight of affection, whirled like atoms of gold-dust in a Sahara-storm of war. Let me name them, this final quartette of noble books that came to me from France. Here is the 'Voix d'Ionie' of Francis Vielé-Griffin, 'voix claire et parfaite et rieuse,' a reissue in collected form of the recent poems, all on Greek subjects, of one of the most accomplished poets of the last generation; here is the 'Un Voyage' of Jacque Vontade ('Fœmina'), the leading woman-essayist of contemporary France, of whose excellent 'Soul of the English' Mr. Walter de la Mare spoke in the July number of this 'Review'; her journey was made through Belgium, Holland, and Germany, and her book, full of penetrating observation, is already a curiosity, since it contains the last record of the life of central Europe, in its old unreformed condition, which literature will offer us. Here are two novels, the 'Romaine Mirmault' of M. Henri de Regnier, and 'Le Démon de Midi' of M. Paul Bourget (a double butterfly this, and a blue one), which I read and re-read with

an emotion quite unrelated to their purely literary merit, because of the pictures they give of that *beau pays de France* which slumbered so unalarmedly in the shadow of its poplars only a few weeks ago.

The sentiment of confidence, of uninterrupted peace, is curiously spread over these four books, and unites them, in spite of their mutual unlikeness, in one haze of serenity. Here is the breathless hush before the tempest breaks. Peace breathes from out 'Fœmina's' delicate and discriminating pages. In Belgium, recalling the shock of battles long ago, she asks 'Comment discerner la moindre trace de ces forces 'cruelles dans la placide finesse, la bonhomie des visages?' Even in the towns of Germany, to the attention of this acute analyst of phenomena, 'l'instinct de batailles et de meurtre 's'est endormi, le cœur d'amour dure et veille, mêlé à l'atmo-'sphère dont il approfondit la rêveuse sérénité.' Marvellous words whose publication preceded by a few days such a magnetic storm of treachery and loathing as the world had never seen before.

It is impossible to form at present any clear notion of what has become of the various elements of French literary life in this sudden dislocation of the entire social system. The young men went forth to fight; the older ones, and the women-writers—dispersed through the provinces, or active in benevolence at the seat of war—almost immediately disappeared. But it is admissible to notice that the very first direct victim of the war was an eminent man of letters. In ordinary times, the death of Jules Lemaître would have attracted wide attention in every country of the world; in France columns in all the newspapers would have been devoted to his career and labours. Coming, as it did, but two days after the declaration of war, it was almost unnoticed even in Paris. But 'without the meed of some melodious tear' so beautiful a figure must not be allowed to vanish. Lemaître had been in failing health for several months, and at last he had been persuaded to leave Paris, and retire to his native village of Tavers, on the north bank of the Loire, a few miles below Orléans. Here, in the calm of this delicious place, in the house where he was born, he was recovering serenity and health, when a newspaper announcing the declaration of war was put into his hands. He fainted at the shock, never

recovered his senses, and died two days later (the 6th of August). Jules Lemaître was, if not the greatest, certainly the most charming critic of his age. No mind more subtle than his has ever been directed to the interpretation of literature, and particularly of the drama. It cannot be doubted that his series of volumes called 'Les Contemporains' did more than any other single work to formulate and regulate taste in Europe at the close of the nineteenth century; he began their publication when he was only twenty-five, and he continued it for ten years. Of his later books, his poems, his plays, his enchanting lectures, his essays—this is not the place to speak, but posterity—if this war with savages should leave a place for posterity—will not forget them. Jules Lemaître, a typical Frenchman of the finest breed, bland and gracious, but with a capacity for sternness, was, like the Cardinal in 'Henry VIII.,'

> 'a scholar, and a right good one,
> Exceeding wise, fair-spoken and persuading;
> Lofty and sour to them that lov'd him not,
> But to those men who sought him, sweet as summer.'

The only previous catastrophe which can be compared with the present war, in its relation to the intellectual life, is that of 1870–1. To realise faintly what is now the condition of literature in France we ought to have before us the parallel of what happened then. But it is a curious fact that the French do not seem to have made any special record of this side of the matter; at all events, I have been unable, among the almost innumerable memoirs of the war of 1870, to find one which confines itself to, or deals expressly with, the disturbance in literature and the fine arts. Lavisse has a very just remark about the condition in the autumn of that year; 'Toute la vie de la France,' he says, 'se taisait.' To break this silence, which still subsists, we must grope about among individual biographies, and bring forth such evidence as may be revealed, as it were under the breath of the speaker, or in an agonised aside. It has seemed appropriate, at this moment, to describe—and partly from unpublished sources—how the calamities which followed Sédan, and particularly the siege of Paris, affected some of the most famous writers of the time. There can be no doubt that our brethren in

France have suffered already, and will increasingly suffer, the same disabilities and injuries and sorrows. To know how the blow fell upon their fathers may help us a little to appreciate how it is falling upon them.

Some days before the 4th of September 1870 Victor Hugo broke the chain of his long exile, and came back to Paris, where he was met at the railway station by shouting crowds. He addressed a rather pompous proclamation to the German nation, of which, as was to be expected, the Prussians took not the slightest notice. Hugo then applied himself to bringing out a new edition of 'Les Châtiments,' and it is worth noting that this was the principal, indeed the only, literary success of the season. There were sold 100,000 copies of these inflammatory and pathetic poems, which were distributed about as commodities rather than as books. By the end of October hawkers from ambulatory stalls were selling piles of 'Les 'Châtiments' among pieces of cocoa-nut, flannel vests, and packets of chocolate. Victor Hugo gave the entire profits to the provision of cannon and ambulances; the principal pieces were recited, by leading actors and actresses, in the squares of Paris. His restlessness became great; he went to Brussels, back to Paris, made excursions to the provinces, even, for a short time, entirely unrecognised, lodged *incognito* in London. It is to be observed that Hugo wrote two large volumes during the height of the war—'L'Année Terrible,' much overpraised by Swinburne, and 'Actes et Paroles,' which is simply a collection of all the appeals, speeches, letters, and manifestos which he had written since the proclamation of the Republic. But neither was published until the war was well over. The revival of 'Ruy-Blas' at the Odéon was hailed as marking the return of legitimate drama; we may notice that this took place in February 1872, eighteen months after the war broke out.

Most of the elderly authors were struck dumb with consternation, and either died before the Germans left France, or remained in a state of suspended animation. The Nestor of them all, Guizot, was just eighty-three when war was declared, and he was totally unprepared for it. He had been anticipating a sort of millennium, and suddenly all his optimism fell from him. He was at his country house in Normandy, and he took to his bed, a wise thing for a very old man to do.

There, while he lay and rested, his energy slowly came back to him, and weak as he was he determined to do to what he could. He wrote two famous letters, one to Mr. Gladstone, the other to Samuel Wilberforce, Bishop of Winchester, fervently praying for the intervention of England. When no answer came, or lukewarm expressions of civility which were worse than none, energy once more seized the noble old Guizot. He rose from his bed and came up to Versailles, where he begged Thiers so insistently to convoke a synod of the Protestant churches, that this was done, and Guizot presided. The vortex of things whirled him back to Normandy, and there he endured the shock of the death of one friend after another, even at last that of his devoted daughter, Mme. Cornelis de Witt. With intrepid persistency he contrived to finish the fourth volume of his great history of France, and his last written words were 'Je laisse le monde bien troublé. Comment 'renaîtra-t-il? Je l'ignore, mais j'y crois. Dites-le, je vous 'prie, à mes amis; je n'aime pas à les savoir découragés.' And his wonderful heroic optimism returned, even in the hour of dissolution, for, on the day he died (the 12th of September 1874), he lifted himself on his pillows, with shining eyes called his attendant to him, and whispered 'Personne 'n'en est plus sûr que moi.' What Guizot was so sure of was the revival of civilisation, the renewal of piety and pity. Shall we to-day be less confident than he?

Alexandre Dumas *père* was in the precise situation in which it would be most unfortunate for an old man to be discovered by the thunderbolt of ill-fortune. Worn out with his colossal work, extravagant in his whole conception of life, Dumas had made no species of provision for the future, and was immediately and completely ruined by the war. He retired to his son's house at Puits, where he fell into a sort of stupor. He was utterly tired out, and when those around him asked whether it would not rouse him from his gloom to write a little, the old novelist replied 'Oh! no, never again.' Almost his last words were: 'They say I have been a spendthrift. 'But I came to Paris with twenty francs, and,' pointing to his last piece of gold on the mantel-piece, 'I have kept them. 'There they are!' He died on the 6th of December, in the darkest hour of the defeat of the army of the Loire and the recapture of Orléans. The German occupation of the country

made it impossible to give his body public burial till February 1871, when the family took the coffin to Villers-Cotterets, his birthplace. When the death of Dumas was officially announced to the French Academy a thing happened which had not happened since the great Revolution—the election of a successor could not take place because only thirteen of the Academicians could be communicated with, no election being valid unless more than twenty take part in it.

The behaviour of individual men of letters, of the elder generation, depended, of course, upon their temperament. Jules Janin, who had just been made an Academician, in the room of Sainte-Beuve, gave way to the counsels of despair; he abandoned literature, his friends, and the world. With a pet parrot in a cage as sole companion, he withdrew to his chalet as soon as the Germans approached Paris, and came forth no more. Littré, on the other hand, displayed an admirable calm. When the enemy threatened Paris in September 1870, Littré proposed to remain, but his friends obliged him to retire to Bordeaux, where Gambetta, in January, contrived to found a chair of history and geography for his support. He sat, as a republican, as Deputy for the Seine in the National Assembly, and although he was unable to speak in public, the Government availed themselves to their great advantage of his vigorous and weighty reports. Littré was not merely a prince among linguists but an independent and liberal thinker, who kept up the courage of others by wise and prudent counsel. A different fate attended a different man when Jules Sandeau, who had long been the petted librarian of the imperial palace of St. Cloud, was doomed to watch the conflagration of both palace and library. He was suddenly turned adrift with a pension of two thousand francs. Sandeau was perhaps the earliest of the great French writers to return to work, for he published his last and worst novel, 'La Roche 'aux Mouettes,' before the close of 1871.

Younger men, who were nevertheless too old to be sent out to fight, suffered more than their elders or juniors, and doubtless will always, in like occasion, suffer most. The instance of Flaubert is tragic in the extreme. He had always looked upon war with detestation, and to the last he refused to believe that it was imminent. Flaubert thought that the whole of Europe should be ruled by one beneficent tyrant,

specially preoccupied with the protection of art and letters. When the Germans entered France, he was at Audemer, feeding his soul with the husks of empty hope and vain illusion. When Rouen was occupied he was seized with hysteric frenzy, and gathering together all his books, his letters, his manuscripts, he burned them. Prussian soldiers were billeted on his house, and as they entered, Flaubert collapsed in a fit of epilepsy which was the worst he had ever endured, and which threatened at first to be fatal. They moved him to Paris, and he recovered a measure of health; it is characteristic that even in his anger and his despair, literature never ceased to occupy the thoughts of Flaubert. But it took a sombre colour of its own, quite unlike any aspect with which it had faced him before. He wanted to write novels about Sédan, and dramas about the occupation of Normandy. He proposed to add a second part to 'L'Education Sentimentale,' bringing it down to date. He wandered among the smoking ruins of the Commune, murmuring 'Quelles brutes! quelles 'brutes!' and rehearsing the sentences in which he would immortalise their crimes.

Théophile Gautier, too, had always dreaded every form of political and military disturbance. His attitude is perhaps the most pathetic that we discern, possibly because its pathos was so obvious at the time. Gautier, the most beloved writer of his age, a glowing exponent of the pure spirit of beauty, not to be thought of in connexion with darkness or ugliness or dejection, 'being,' as Swinburne said of him, 'so near the 'sun-god's face,' had suffered cruelly in previous distractions, and particularly in those of 1848. He was a gorgeous heliconian lepidopter to whom a drop of rain was ruin. Poor Gautier, when the Prussians formed round Paris, said:

'If I knew an honest Turk who loved French verses, I would settle in his house at Constantinople: in exchange for a few sonnets to the glory of the Prophet, I would beg for a dish of pilaw to eat, a tchibouck to smoke, a carpet to lie down upon, and I would try to forget that I was born into the races of the West, those races that murder and burn and steal, and then turn and say "I am civilisation!"'

Presently, he longed to lie down, not on a carpet but on the pavement of the street, and die. There was a legend that he 'retired into his tower of ivory,' but Gautier had no such

retreat. He was assailed by the blackness of poverty, and Du Camp describes meeting him during the siege, dragging his limbs, prematurely old, his magnificent eyes veiled under their puffed eyelids, and answering, when asked how he was, ' Saturated with horror ! '

A group of some of the most interesting men of letters in France had been in the habit of dining together at the Café Brébant, and it appears from diaries of the time, and particularly from the journal of Edmond de Goncourt, that they kept up this practice through the siege and well on into the excesses of the Commune. Here Renan, Paul de St. Victor, and Berthelot were constant attendants, and others, now less famous, who enjoyed some private means and were not entirely dependent on their pen for a dinner. We have strange glimpses of their melancholy symposia : St. Victor wailing out his apocalyptical visions of Death on the pale horse galloping over the fields of France, Renan throwing his arms up to heaven and quoting long passages of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, Goncourt cynically exciting the others to fury by his ironies, Berthelot losing himself in ingenious theories of what chemistry might do to annihilate the German army with explosives and miasmas hitherto undreamed of by mankind. Across this lugubrious company we see passing the strange figure of Zola, occupied with the plan of a series of novels, ' an epic in ten volumes,' on the life of a modern family of France—a scheme which worked itself out eventually, in many volumes more than ten, as the famous ' Rougon-Macquart ' series. But Zola, who was much younger than the rest, is the only one of these men of letters who is displayed to us as continuously involved in literary ambition. For the rest, the horrible months, the interminable, desolated, mutilated months, were mere tracts of intellectual wilderness.

In this desert there were some oases of confidence and courage. It is, indeed, curious to note the apparent contradictions which we meet with in the records of that time. On one hand we seem to see a complete paralysis of social order and habit ; on the other, within the same stricken city of Paris, life appears following its usual course with singular docility. In contrast to the attitude of Gautier and Flaubert, we must observe that of Gaston Paris, who had just been elected to the Chair of Romance Languages at the Collège de France, and who had

announced his first lectures for the autumn and winter of 1870. He was urged to abandon them, but he refused, and, wonderful to relate, they were largely attended. A distinguished French writer, who was a youth at that time, and an auditor of these lectures, tells me that the noble calm of Gaston Paris, his serene enthusiasm for learning, and his skill in illustrating by medieval examples the unconquerable genius of France, had a miraculous effect in comforting and strengthening young men through those sinister weeks of depression.

The conditions of life during the war of 1870–1 are reflected in several books which are little known in England, and which have a vivid and poignant interest for us to-day. The poet and academician, Victor de Laprade, published in 1872 a volume written 'Pendant la Guerre,' which is well worthy of resuscitation. Laprade, however, gives the provincial and not the Parisian point of view, and his observations were made in Lyons, where, having suffered heavily under the Empire for the independence of his political utterances, he was living at the outbreak of the war in honourable seclusion. But a still more valuable work—and that perhaps which gives the very best impression of the mental disturbance caused by the agitations of hope and fear during the invasion—is 'Une 'Famille pendant la Guerre,' which consists of letters supposed to be written, and doubtless in the main really written, from country villages in different parts of the invaded provinces during the whole time that the Germans were in France. This book was written by a young woman of great penetration of mind, whose name was Boissonas. It was not printed until 1873, when it enjoyed a wide success, but it has long been out of print. It would be a very useful step for some publisher now to take to reissue these admirable impressions.

The bewilderment of spirit, the species of hallucination into which intellectual people, doomed to inaction, fell is well illustrated by an incident which I owe to my valued friend, his Excellency the French Ambassador in Washington. It refers to Sully Prudhomme, who was the youngest hope of French poetry when the war broke out in 1870. Sully Prudhomme had greatly desired to fight, but the state of his health made it impossible. He remained in Paris, a prey almost to despair. Gaston Paris, who was Sully Prudhomme's greatest friend, told M. Jusserand that during the siege of Paris the poet was

crossing the Place St. Augustin when he lost his way. He asked a man to guide him and was shown his direction, but falling again immediately into a lugubrious reverie he lost it before leaving the Place. He was obliged to ask his way once more, but unfortunately he did so of the very man he had asked originally, who had stopped there watching the odd movements of the poet. This man, now assured that all was wrong, called out 'A spy! a spy!', a crowd gathered, two gendarmes hurried up and Sully Prudhomme was hustled very roughly a long way off to the Hôtel de Ville. Once there, explanations were easy, and full apologies were tendered to the already-famous author of 'Les Epreuves' and 'Les 'Solitudes.' The authorities courteously asked what they could do to express their grief at so wretched a mistake. 'Only 'this,' Sully Prudhomme replied, 'let me go back to the Place 'St. Augustin arm-in-arm with the same two gendarmes who 'brought me hither.'

Sully Prudhomme was one of the few pure men of letters in whom the creative imagination was not paralysed during the war. He wrote a little sheaf of pieces called 'Impressions de 'la Guerre,' which belong to the spring of 1871, and these bear upon them, in their imperfection, signs of the intense and painful agitation of the author's mind. As often occurs in like occasions, the emotion in the poet's brain was too violent and too immediate to allow of due artistic expression. At such times, little is effective in poetry save the denunciations of unmeasured anger. But some of Sully Prudhomme's tender fancies are very pathetic. He addresses the blossoms which sprang from the battle-fields of the north of France in the April of 1871: he reproaches these *fleurs de sang* with their careless beauty:

'O fleurs, de vos tuniques neuves
Refermez tristement les plis:
Ne vous sentez-vous pas les veuves
Des jeunes cœurs ensevelis?

A nos malheurs indifférents,
Vous vous étalez sans remords:
Fleurs de France, un peu nos parents,
Vous devriez pleurer nos morts.'

Somebody, in the course of 1871, ventured to rally Victor Hugo on the relaxation of his zeal for the form of government

which he had so long and so enthusiastically recommended. The poet admitted that the Commune had, for the time at least, taken away his appetite for republics. Much more positive injury was done to art and literature by the Gardes Nationaux than by the Germans, and this is a fact which must ever be galling to French self-respect. We may almost set against the crime of Louvain the destruction of the Library of the Louvre, the old Bibliothèque du Roi. Under the Commune the thirty volumes of the Trésor de Noailles, the seven hundred volumes of the Gillet and Saint Genis collections, perished by fire. The wretches poured petroleum on the book-shelves, and soaked the bundles of priceless manuscripts; then they set flame to the whole and fled. Out of the neighbouring windows of the Louvre, the custodians gazed with blanched faces, and asked one another 'Will it be our turn next?' According to a story which lacks confirmation, the blowing-up of Notre Dame had been decided upon by the Communard Government, and was only prevented by the exertions of the young poet, Verlaine, who had been made Chef de Bureau de la Presse. These were not times in which the intellectual part of Paris could keep calm from one hour to another.

During the siege, it is not too much to say that every brain was occupied with the nightmare caused by lack of food. This alone made mental concentration impossible. There is no more curious evidence remaining than is given in some verses written by Victor Hugo, in a balloon-epistle, on the 10th of January 1871. It may not be poetry, but it is amazingly vivid:

> 'Nous mangeons du cheval, du rat, de l'ours, de l'âne.
> Paris est si bien pris, cerné, muré, noué,
> Gardé, que notre ventre est l'arche de Noé;
> Dans nos flancs toute bête, honnête ou mal-famée,
> Pénètre, et chien et chat, le mammon, le pygmée,
> Tout entre, et la souris rencontre l'éléphant.'

Prussia, the gigantic tigress, held Paris in her claws, and was biting the great palpitating heart of France, and the form her death-stroke took was starvation. There was no exaggeration in Hugo's catalogue of foods. One night, at Brébant's, what was called a roast saddle of mutton was served to the men of letters. It was admirably cooked, but a waiter admitted that it was really the side of a Newfoundland dog. The hyper-

sensitive Renan, who had swallowed a mouthful, turned green and rushed from the table; the rest, more philosophical, decided that, whatever the mutton might be zoologically, it was delicious; and they finished the 'saddle.' Ingenious ideas about food and cooking more and more absorbed their thoughts as the siege progressed.

The element of noise, again, recurs incessantly in the memoirs of the war, and this produced in the minds of sensitive and imaginative persons a perpetual agitation. The constant riot of explosions and detonations, rumblings and tramplings, made all effort to sustain thought impossible. The attention was at every moment terrified and distracted. Again, Paris was burning on both sides, 'l'éternel incendie' of St. Cloud was followed by the endless conflagration of Auteuil. The artillery of the Germans, and then that of the Versaillais, shook the houses to their foundations in perpetual earthquakes, so that pictures and bric-à-brac had to be put in cellars, while books were shaken off their shelves, and lay in dog's-eared heaps along the floors. It was not until the fall of the Commune and the resumption of something like steady government that Paris began to recover from these distracting conditions, and accordingly it is not until after June 1871 that we begin to find literature reasserting itself, and pushing frail shoots up from under the deep layer of dust and scoria that the war had spread over it.

Then it was that, as Théodore de Banville has assured us, Gautier, who had been lying on his bed every day from morning to night, dozing, and reading over and over again the same classic verses, woke up in his narrow bare bedroom in the Rue de Beaune and began to write 'Emaux et Camées' once more. Then it was that Flaubert, over whom the cataclysm seemed to have passed without altering an iota in his character or habits, brought out the MS. of 'La Tentation de Saint Antoine' and became absorbed in its elaboration. But it was not until December that Edmond de Goncourt,—who may be taken as the purest type of the normal man of letters, entirely devoted to the profession of literature, but not like Flaubert and Gautier detached from all other interests,—that Goncourt was able to settle his mind to the fabrication of a novel. We may say that the war caused a suspension in France of all literary composition of the higher kind during sixteen or seventeen months.

But it is important to observe that this was a suspension, not a determination. On the face of a history of French literature in the nineteenth century the war of 1870–1 makes scarcely a scar. Even in the biographies of men of letters it is discovered only as a halting-place, not as a break in continuity. A long illness or a voyage round the world would compete with the war of 1870–1 in the mark it might make on the continuous production of a French poet of that age. Those who had private resources withdrew very carefully to their shelters, and sucked their paws like bears till the long winter of their discontent was over. In many cases the war stored up their talents, and concentrated their powers. In particular, it intensified their capacities. People who had loved the fatherland coldly in times of piping peace, blew the coals of their hearts up into a living flame, and the enchantment of France reasserted itself. When the enemy was gone, they took up their work, on the old lines, but with threefold and fourfold zeal. The temper of French imaginative literature is clearly displayed in a fine series of sonnets by Sully Prudhomme, written some years later, called ' La France ' ; space does not lend itself here to long quotation, or I would print in this connexion that which begins ' Vous qui, des beaux loisirs ' empruntant les beaux noms.' Germany strove to quench the inner flame on the altar of French genius, and she hardly succeeded in extinguishing for the moment a few candles at the church-door.

When we turn to conditions in our own country, we must remember that the effect of such a war as we are conducting is not comparable with that produced in France by the invasion of 1870. If we were, indeed, to be successfully invaded, the entire outlook of literature in England would be modified to a degree which it is now useless to attempt to foresee. We have a solemn confidence in our navy, and we do not allow ourselves to imagine so great a calamity as its defeat. There is, therefore, no reasonable fear of such a catastrophic cessation of all literary activity as was produced in France early in the month of August last. But the absorption of interest, concentrated on the action of the Allies and on nothing else, had the effect of closing down as immediately, although not so violently or completely, the traffic in books in London. In Paris, during the first weeks of this war, new works by popular

authors, which had been selling in very large numbers, died finally and suddenly. For instance, the novel by M. Paul Bourget—' Le Démon de Midi,' of which I have spoken—had been selling at the rate of several hundreds a day. After the declaration of war, as I am told, not one single further copy was bought. If we take into consideration the fact that August and September are the months during which the sale of books in England is normally at its lowest, it may be that the decline, though rapid, was not abrupt. A country whose soil is not in imminent danger must always be slower to realise its position than a country actually invaded.

Nor has anything yet happened which should completely cut off the stream of current literature. It will be to the interest of the publishers, even at a greatly diminished profit, to keep that stream flowing as long as they can, in order to float upon it the works which they have paid for, printed and bound, ready for the autumn season which they expected. Of these it is reasonable to expect that a great many will in due course succeed in being issued, and that every attempt will be made to secure for them what distracted attention a public exercised in other directions can possibly be induced to spare. It is even conceivable that a certain animation of the book-trade may display itself in the late autumn, and an appearance of vitality be evident. How it is to be evinced in a world from which the publisher's advertisement and the book-review have alike vanished, it is rather hard to say. But what we must really face is the fact that this harvest of volumes, be it what it may, will mark the end of what is called ' current ' literature,' for the remaining duration of the war. There can be no aftermath, we can aspire to no revival. The book which does not deal directly and crudely with the complexities of warfare and the various branches of strategy, will, from Christmas onwards, not be published at all.

Authors, therefore, if they have not the privilege of fighting, or of otherwise taking active part in the defence of our country, will be subjected to the most painful restrictions. They will have to breathe, so well as they can, in a Leyden jar of neglect and oblivion. When the mountains and the heritage of Esau were laid waste by the dragons of the wilderness, we are told that those who feared the Lord spoke often one to another. In the coming days of drought and discomfort, while so much

active benevolence is distributed, the authors of England will be drawn more and more to one another, and must organise, without fussiness or self-advertisement, more and more effective schemes of mutual help. Young writers, in particular, will be sure to suffer, and those branches of literature which are most delicate, admirable and original will be attacked suddenly, and for the time being fatally. For the rubbishy romance, 'without a dull page from cover to cover,' and for the popular essay made up of daisy-chains of commonplace reflection, we need feel no regret. The silencing of these importunate babblings will be a public benefit. But the writer, who, at the outset of what promised to be a brilliant career, was concentrating the intensity of his energies, without thought of gain, on the production of works of positive merit,—he deserves and he must receive from those who value the intellectual wealth of the nation all the succour that can be spared to him. For he also is a patriot, who dedicates his imagination to the glory of his country.

EDMUND GOSSE.

THE RED CROSS

1. **Report upon the State of the Hospitals of the British Army in the Crimea and Scutari.** Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1855.
2. **Un Souvenir de Solférino.** Par HENRY DUNANT. Genève. 1862.
3. **Help for the Sick and Wounded.** By MM. MOYNIER AND APPIA. Translated by JOHN FURLEY. John Camden Hotten. 1870.
4. **Telegrams respecting Hospital Arrangements for the Troops in South Africa.** Eyre and Spottiswoode. 1900.
5. **Papers relating to the Geneva Convention, 1906.** Wyman and Sons. 1908.

WHEN Lord Raglan decided that his instructions to prepare for the siege of Sebastopol under certain conditions were equivalent to 'an absolute order,' one of his first thoughts was to solicit the advice of Dr. John Hall as to what arrangements ought to be made 'for the comfort of the 'wounded.' In reply to that request Dr. Hall, the Inspector General of Hospitals, committed to paper 'a few observations,' in the course of which he wrote: 'The site selected by the staff 'surgeon of a brigade for the reception of the wounded should 'be as sheltered as possible; and, if not easily distinguished, '*a flag should be put up.*'

Doubtless the twentieth century reader will jump to the conclusion that he is perfectly familiar with the kind of flag Dr. Hall had in mind. But he will be profoundly mistaken. No Red Cross flag was seen on the battle-fields of the Crimea. Not on the arms of surgeons or hospital orderlies, nor on the cumbersome ambulance waggons, nor on the arabas of the Turks or the mule litters of the French, nor on the bell tents or marquees in which the wounded were herded, was there seen any vestige of that emblem which is now inseparable from the ministrations of those who succour the victims of war. For in 1854 the Red Cross was unknown—unknown, that is, in its now familiar significance. There is no parity between the Red Cross knight of Spenser's verse or the Templar of the Crusades and the Red Cross champion of to-day; for

Spenser's ' gentle knight ' was an etherealised replica of the Crusader, who, in turn, was a warrior monk pledged to deal rather than heal wounds. To the Templar the Red Cross emblazoned on his white mantle was the symbol of his championship of Holy Land pilgrims, while the white ground upon which it was embroidered was the emblem of his vow of chastity. The Knights Templars, indeed, were a purely military order, having nothing in common with the Hospitallers. On the other hand, however, one form of cross has always been the badge of the beneficent order of St. John of Jerusalem, but that emblem conformed to the Maltese type, that is an eight-pointed white cross on a black ground.

Lord Raglan's anxiety for ' the comfort of the wounded ' was at least a significant admission of the duty of the State towards the soldiers who fought its battles. As the outcome of the Crimean campaign that duty was shortly afterwards officially defined in these terms : ' To the soldier the government ' stands in the place of the Friendly Society.' Such a phrase is the measure of the growth of humanitarian sentiment which has taken place since the middle of the nineteenth century, for to-day, in place of so cold a relation, it is generally recognised that in time of war the duty of the State is to supply as far as possible the solicitous and even affectionate attentions of the family which the soldier has left in order to defend his country.

To the casual reader, Dr. Hall's ' few observations ' of sixty years ago will perhaps seem to have made adequate preparations for ' the comfort of the wounded ' in the Crimea. Taking one division of the army as the unit basis of his scheme, he advised the provision of four large store waggons, six spring waggons for ambulance purposes, and ninety-six stretchers. In addition to the reserve supplies of medicines, materials, and medical comforts carried in the waggons, each battalion surgeon was required to be accompanied by a pack horse bearing his instruments and all medicines, etc. for immediate use, while prior to taking the field the principal medical officer was charged with the duty of making a close inspection of the entire equipment from the quantities of *tinct. opii* to the last strap and buckle of the pack horses. Dr. Hall also gave the surgeons sound advice on such matters as instructing orderlies, preparing for an action, how to deal with the wounded on the battle-field, the best method of securing their comfort in

temporary hospitals, etc., etc. He even insisted that when a landing was effected in the enemy's country the surgeons' horses and panniers should have preference over all others.

Yet, as is common knowledge, these seemingly elaborate preparations for the care of the sick and wounded in the Crimea proved disastrously inadequate. All the surgeons and most of the hospital officials admitted as much. One of the exceptions, however, was so significant that it should be carefully noted. 'I served through the whole of the 'Peninsular War,' testified Mr. Ward, purveyor of the base hospital at Scutari; 'the patients were never so comfortable as 'they are here. . . . Even when we returned to our own country 'from Walcheren and Corunna, the comforts we got were by 'no means equal to what we have here.' None of the surgeons could pretend to such lengthy service as the purveyor; his claim to have been through the Peninsular War shows that he had been at least forty-five years in the army; and that fact is of the utmost importance in estimating the value of his comparative evidence. Here, for once, was a veteran for whom there were no 'good old days'; Tommy Atkins had never been so 'comfortable,' no, not even in his native land. But two things had escaped the observation of the optimistic Mr. Ward: he was unconscious of the world's progress towards humanitarian ideals, and he forgot that the Crimean was the first campaign fought in the full glare of newspaper publicity.

Those considerations, plus the fact that England had been at peace for many years, made all the difference. The surgeons of the Crimea, apart from the consideration that they were accustomed to social conditions widely different from those with which the hospital purveyor was familiar, represented a new generation, and they were not so ultra-loyal to the army that they were prepared to sacrifice humanitarian instincts to military discipline. In brief, they only needed an excuse to speak out. And that excuse was provided by William Howard Russell, the correspondent of 'The Times.'

There is no necessity to give a résumé of the startling revelations which Mr. Russell made in his letters of the 15th and 22nd of September 1854, nor to dwell afresh on the alacrity with which Florence Nightingale responded to Sidney Herbert's appeal to proceed to Scutari and reorganise the nursing

service there; but what is too often forgotten is that the Secretary of War, the Duke of Manchester, two days subsequent to Miss Nightingale's departure, and while none of Mr. Russell's allegations had been corroborated, directed an efficient commission to proceed immediately to the Crimea and make a thorough inquiry into the condition and wants of the sick and wounded soldiers, and also into the state of the hospital accommodation and the supply of medical stores and comforts. The commission was armed with plenary powers, and one of its members was selected specially on account of his judicial, witness-examining experience.

When the commissioners, after three months' rigorous investigation, issued their report, Mr. Russell's charges were found to be completely justified. If the report was written in a drier style than that of the war correspondent, its verdict was none the less severe. The commissioners were unanimously of the opinion that ambulance waggons were absolutely lacking at the opening stages of the campaign, that those eventually supplied were insufficient in number, and soon, owing to the condition of the roads, could not be used at all; that the hospital accommodation in the field was entirely inadequate, and also unsuitable in nature; that there was an appalling lack of bedsteads, stretchers, and cooking utensils; that the supply of medicines, surgical materials, and ordinary comforts was woefully scanty; and that although the orderlies were amply sufficient in number they were in every other respect 'most unsatisfactory.' The commissioners, in fact, were in complete accord with those surgeons who made the following pitiful reports:

'Before we commenced our march from the landing at Old Fort, the hospital marquee, canteens, and bedding, were ordered to be re-embarked, and there were but four water mules for the whole battalion. The sick or wounded were, in short, thrown entirely overboard, one small circular tent only being allowed for a whole regiment. The consequences soon became apparent; when men fell out of the ranks from exhaustion, or were seized with sudden disease, of which cholera was the most frequent, the medical officers could render no effectual aid. The regiment moved on, and the victims were compelled to drag themselves miserably along or to perish where they lay. In short, they were left to their fate.'

'During the late severe affliction of cholera, when the admission and discharge book was converted almost exclusively into a registry of deaths, it was most melancholy to see the men wet, wearied, and

half naked, borne by their comrades, or dragging themselves slowly and painfully along to a hospital tent wholly unprovided with anything for their comfort. Destitute of bedding, blankets, and of fuel, it was impossible to produce or maintain even that degree of mere animal heat that was requisite for their recovery.'

'We marched on the 19th, and fought the battle of Alma. On the 20th, when the Light Division had about 1000 killed and wounded, there were no ambulances, etc., etc., or lights (save the personal property of the officers)—nearly all the operations requiring to be performed on the ground. I, myself, operated the whole of the first day on the poor fellows on the ground, and had performed many on the second (two of them being hip joint cases), until an old door was discovered, of which we made a table, and of course performed all my other operations (including another hip joint case on a Russian) on the same.'

Amid the welter of distressing facts brought to light by the commission, two were specially notable, namely, the utter inefficiency of the hospital orderlies and the paucity of the 'comforts' officially provided for the sick and wounded. The orderlies were selected from the combatant troops, and they were so chosen, not for any skill in tending the patients, but because they were 'the most delicate men' in the ranks! The new attendants necessitated by a sudden influx of wounded, one surgeon observed, had to 'learn their duties at the very 'moment when they should be most proficient in them.' Another reported: 'They are wholly untrained, never were 'in hospital before, and their ignorance of their duties makes 'our position all the more trying. They are generally speaking 'very untidy. . . . For the ordinary purposes of hospital 'attendants, they are, with few exceptions, worthless.' Even more notable, as a contrast between present ideals and those of sixty years ago, is the wide disparity which marked State recognition of its duty towards wounded soldiers, as compared with the new humanitarianism represented by Miss Nightingale. Soon after her arrival at Scutari she had at her disposal a generous supply of those 'comforts' which the stay-at-home public is so ready to contribute in time of war, and a comparison of the various articles included in that store with the list of items then recognised as necessary by the army reveals the fact that the government assumed no responsibility to provide even wounded soldiers with cotton or flannel shirts, drawers, comforters, handkerchiefs, towels, hair pillows, basins, lamps, or operating tables. As for such

delicacies as chicken broth, arrowroot, milk, brandy, port wine, and eggs, the chief source of supply was Miss Nightingale's privately contributed store. In fact, in 1854 the State had not even attained the Friendly Society view of its duty to wounded soldiers.

If, however, the State was as yet unresponsive to the more sympathetic ideals of the age, let it be remembered to the honour of the over-worked surgeons of the Crimea that several of their number had a keen appreciation of the reforms demanded by those ideals. 'We require,' one of them wrote, 'a 'properly organised ambulance, with stout, active, and intelli- 'gent men, who could carry off the wounded quickly to receive 'surgical assistance, or act as orderlies when not otherwise 'employed.' And another went still further in his comprehension of the needs of the battle-field. He favoured the formation of a corps of men who should be 'taught to put on 'torniquets and bandages, to lift a wounded man with the 'least possible pain, and to adjust a fractured limb in the best 'position until seen by a medical officer.' In those words, written sixty years ago, may be discerned the germ of the Royal Army Medical Corps of to-day. And, while detracting no whit from the priceless services of Miss Nightingale in evolving order out of the chaos of military hospital nursing and organisation, it ought to be remembered that the reforms suggested by the surgeons anticipated the recommendations of 'the Lady of the Lamp.'

But another and even more significant finding of the commission of 1854 remains to be mentioned. One of the surgeons declared that 'no proper means of treating sick in regimental 'hospitals while in the field can be adopted, unless at much 'inconvenience to the public service,' and that startling view was so far accepted by the commissioners that they reported that 'under existing circumstances, and indeed at all times of 'great pressure, it may be found impracticable to provide a 'sufficiently large body of hospital servants.' So it appears that the surgeon and the commissioners had attained an inkling of the vitally important axiom that in 'times of great 'pressure,' that is, in warlike operations on a large scale, no army medical service can possibly be equal to the demands made upon it. The truth so discreetly veiled by the surgeon in his phrase 'unless at much inconvenience to the public

'service,' when translated into plain terms means, that a commander-in-chief has of necessity to think more of killing his enemies than of succouring his own wounded soldiers: everything in a campaign, even the agonies of its victims, must be subservient to the one object of victory; hence, when, after a battle, it is necessary for the conquering army to move forward, its medical staff must go forward too, even if sick and wounded have to be abandoned. The truth, in fact, was for once and all irrefutably stated by M. Frégier when he wrote:

'At every period, and amongst all nations, from Cyrus down to Napoleon III., the personnel and *matériel* of the army medical departments, or the corps analogous to these, charged with the care and transport of the victims of war, have been insufficient: This is an undisputed and incontestable fact, written on every page of the world's military annals.'

And lest it may be imagined that conditions are better to-day, it should be sufficient to recall that, so recently as last year, a distinguished soldier confessed that if voluntary aid were not available it would be necessary to create a regular medical force 'so very large that it would materially increase 'the burden of taxation on the country.' That Japan's record in the treatment of the sick and wounded in her struggle with Russia was so satisfactory was largely due to the million voluntary workers who supplemented the army medical corps.

Whence came the inspiration which created this beneficent auxiliary? From a Swiss philanthropist named Henry Dunant. 'I wish,' said Mr. Gladstone, 'some one of the 'thousand who in prose justly celebrate Miss Nightingale 'would say a single word for the man of "routine" who 'devised and projected her going—Sidney Herbert.' The same observation might be made on behalf of M. Dunant. Although his work has been more potent for good than that of Miss Nightingale, and of a more world-wide influence, his name may be sought in vain in encyclopædias or biographical dictionaries. It is familiar, of course, to those versed in Red Cross history, but utterly unknown to 'the man in the street.' Yet it was through his efforts that, in 1864, Europe was 'covered, as if by enchantment, with a network of committees 'for the relief of wounded soldiers.' He was, in fact, the true and only begetter of the Red Cross movement.

An accident started the chain of circumstances by which

M. Dunant achieved that enviable renown. It so happened that in the early summer of 1859 he left his native Switzerland for a pleasure tour in northern Italy, and that on the June day on which the battle of Solferino was fought he was in the vicinity of that sanguinary conflict. Unlike the ordinary tourist, M. Dunant did not make a hasty flight from that scene of carnage; on the contrary, his benevolent instincts prompted him to explore the battle-field in the hope of rendering Samaritan service. There was ample scope for such aid as he could give. More than 20,000 wounded were in dire need of succour, and notwithstanding the efficiency of the French medical service, many days elapsed ere they received even the most elementary attention. Solferino, in fact, was one of those occasions of 'great pressure' when an army ambulance organisation becomes hopelessly inadequate.

That unexpected experience of the havoc of war made an ineffaceable impression on M. Dunant. He remained at Solferino as long as he could be of any assistance, wandering far and wide over the battle-field to gather in the wounded, and then passing from one improvised hospital to another to tend their bedsides; but when at last he returned to his native Geneva he carried with him the memory of such poignant suffering as left him no peace until he had written 'Un Souvenir 'de Solférino.' Surely the most unique 'souvenir' ever brought home by tourist! In simple, eloquent words this little book repictured the distressing scenes its author had witnessed, and then presented a series of cogent arguments in favour of the formation, in time of peace, of 'relief societies, whose aim 'should be to help the wounded in time of war, by means 'of volunteers, zealous, devoted and well qualified for such 'a work.' Those words are the charter of the Red Cross movement.

For M. Dunant was not content with writing his book. That was merely a means to a bigger end. But an effective means, as it proved. Numerous editions were called for in Geneva, and it was speedily translated into other languages. While, however, his printed word was fructifying an international harvest field, he had taken another step forward in his native city. There was already in existence there an organisation known as the Genevese Society of Public Utility, of which he was a member, and on his initiative, at a meeting held on the

9th of February 1863, a protracted discussion took place on the advisability of forming such relief societies as he had advocated in 'Un Souvenir de Solferino.' The issue of that debate was the appointment of a small committee for further and more careful consideration of the question, the upshot of which was a decision to submit the matter to an international conference. Invitations to such a conference were despatched on the 1st of September, and on the 26th of the following month thirty-six delegates assembled in the Athenæum rooms of Geneva to deliberate on M. Dunant's momentous proposition. Eighteen of the delegates, it should be remembered, were the semi-official representatives of fourteen governments.

Naturally an agendum had been prepared, a *Projet de Concordat* embodying the views of the Genevese committee, consisting of six general propositions and four specific articles. The six general propositions may be briefly summarised as committing the conference to the advisability of the formation of National Committees for the purpose of remedying 'the 'inadequacy of the official sanitary service of armies on active 'service,' and the necessity of such committees occupying themselves with careful preparations for such a task; the four additional articles were in these terms:

'In case of war, the Committees of the belligerent nations shall furnish the necessary aid to their respective armies, and, in particular, shall provide for the formation and organisation of corps of volunteer nurses. They shall solicit the support of the Committees belonging to neutral nations.

'The volunteer nurses shall bind themselves to serve during a limited time, and not in any way to meddle in the operations of the war. They shall be employed, according to their wish, in field-service or in that of the hospitals. Females will necessarily be assigned to the latter.

'The volunteer nurses shall wear a uniform in all countries, or an identical distinctive badge. Their person shall be sacred, and military chiefs shall afford them protection. At the commencement of a campaign, the soldiers of both armies shall be informed of the existence of these corps, and of their exclusively benevolent character.

'The corps of nurses or volunteer helpers shall march in the rear of the armies, to which they shall not cause any embarrassment, nor occasion any expense. They shall have their own means of carriage, victuals, and medical stores of all kinds.'

Such was the programme submitted to the delegates of

1863. The deliberations lasted four days, but most of that time was occupied in discussing the articles quoted above, for there was no diversity of opinion concerning the six general propositions. That the four articles applying the general propositions to time of war should have evoked contrary views was natural, seeing that several of the delegates were military officers and surgeons. As they stood, those four articles threatened the formation of an army of camp followers virtually independent of the commander-in-chief, and with full liberty to invade battle-fields at their will. Consequently, those articles were considerably modified in the resolutions which became the finding of the conference—modified, that is, in the direction of giving the military authorities the initiative in utilising the services of the volunteer nurses.

One of the articles, that in favour of an identical uniform or badge for all the volunteers irrespective of nationality, underwent a significant transformation. It will be observed that the Genevese Society made no recommendation as to the character of the uniform or badge, leaving that an open question. The conference, however, was not content with so nebulous a resolution, and unanimously decided that

> ' The volunteer nurses shall wear, in all countries, a white band round the arm with a red cross upon it, as a distinctive and uniform badge.'

In addition the conference also unanimously agreed to the following :

> ' That an identical distinctive sign shall be adopted for the medical corps of all armies, or, at least, for all persons attached to this service in the same army. That an identical flag be also adopted for the field and stationary hospitals of all armies.'

In the first of these resolutions, then, the Red Cross definitely emerges into the history of humanitarianism. But why was that emblem chosen ? Not, as has sometimes been imagined, because of its connexion with the Knights Templars ; nor, as might naturally be supposed, on account of its relation to the great world sacrifice on Calvary ; but in compliment to the Swiss originators of that beneficent conference, for the Red Cross on a white ground was obtained by reversing the Federal national colours. To placate the sentiment of non-Christian nations, indeed, the Red Cross is officially described as an

' heraldic emblem.' In addition to defining the distinctive badge for the volunteer nurses, the conference expressed a wish that some universal emblem might be adopted by the medical corps of all armies, and also that their field and stationary hospitals might be indicated by an ' identical flag,' though no decision was reached as to the form of that official emblem or flag.

One other important recommendation was made by the conference of 1863, to the effect

> ' That, in time of war, neutrality should be proclaimed by the belligerent nations for the field and stationary hospitals, and that it may be accorded, in the most complete manner, to all officials employed in sanitary work, to volunteer nurses, to the inhabitants of the country who shall assist the wounded, and to the wounded themselves.'

Nothing comparable to that recommendation had been included in the agendum of the Genevese Society, yet that afterthought of the conference was destined to be as epoch-making as the decision in favour of the National Committees. For it was that recommendation in the interests of neutrality which led directly to the Geneva Congress of 1864, a gathering which must be clearly distinguished from the conference of 1863.

Although, as noted above, eighteen of the delegates to the conference of 1863 had a quasi-official standing, they had no power to pledge their governments to any findings that might be agreed upon ; and the remaining eighteen delegates were limited to such influence as might attach to their social standing or philanthropic repute. In short, the conference of 1863 was nothing more than a deliberative body of unimpeachable intentions, and, if it had not been for subsequent events, it might have met, discussed, and dissolved without effecting any more concrete results than have followed the aspirations of many other altruistic gatherings.

As it happened, however, tangible results were speedily forthcoming. In various countries national relief committees were quickly founded, and the International Committee at Geneva at once addressed itself to the new project in favour of neutrality for all medical corps. The first step was to sound the governments of Europe, and when it was ascertained that fifteen had responded in a friendly manner, the Federal

Council of Switzerland undertook to issue the formal invitations, explaining that as it did not maintain a permanent army it occupied a more disinterested position than any other government. The response to that invitation was most gratifying, no fewer than sixteen governments appointing representatives to the congress, twelve of whom were accredited with treaty powers. After fourteen days' deliberation a neutrality Convention was agreed upon, and at once signed by the twelve delegates who were authorised to commit their respective countries. This was the famous Geneva Convention of 1864, which eventually, between the 22nd of August 1864 and July of 1907, was acceded to by fifty-four governments.

What did that Convention accomplish? Briefly, it created an oasis of peace in the midst of war. It gave Mercy a territory in the domain of Mars. It agreed that ambulances and military hospitals were to be regarded as neutral and protected and respected by combatants; that the personnel of such ambulances and hospitals, including chaplains, should participate in the benefit of neutrality while attending the wounded; that inhabitants of the war area who succoured the wounded should also be respected and their houses immune if used for hospital purposes; and that 'wounded or sick 'soldiers shall be entertained and taken care of, to whatever 'nation they may belong.' And, finally, the Convention, in addition to recognising the Red Cross armlet or brassard authorised by the conference of 1863, stipulated that all hospitals and ambulances should be uniformly designated by a Red Cross flag.

One important omission cannot fail to be remarked by the careful reader of the Geneva Convention of 1864: it made not the most indirect allusion to the voluntary relief committees which were being established in agreement with the conference of 1863. And more than forty years were to elapse ere Red Cross and kindred societies received recognition in a formal treaty between the nations.

But in England the conference of 1863 began to bear fruit in 1870. Even so, however, England, as has not seldom been the case, lagged behind the other nations, for Prussia and Austria and Denmark established their national relief committees in 1864. Nevertheless, it is some mitigation of British slackness to remember that in 1868 a few members of the Order

of St. John of Jerusalem in England did band themselves together into a provisional committee, with a view to the ultimate formation of a national relief society. Yet nothing was done until the outbreak of the Franco-German war precipitated matters. Ere that conflict was a week old, Mr. (now Sir) John Furley, one of the most active members of the St. John committee, called upon the wealthy and generous Colonel Loyd-Lindsay (afterwards Lord Wantage) to ask his assistance in founding a British Red Cross Society. Colonel Loyd-Lindsay was soon convinced, and so practically convinced that he at once wrote a letter to 'The Times' urging the formation of such a society, and started the necessary fund with a cheque for £1000.

For some unaccountable reason, notwithstanding the existence of several national societies which had incorporated the words 'Red Cross' in their titles, the organisation founded in London in 1870 was verbosely described as 'The National 'Society for Aid to the Sick and Wounded in War.' As it did not exemplify the principle of *in pace para bellum*, its earliest efforts to relieve the sufferings of the stricken fields of France and Germany were somewhat confused, but eventually, thanks to the white heat of Mr. Furley's zeal and his genius for extemporary organisation, the society, at the end of the war, was able to contemplate its record with satisfaction, and to reflect that it had spent nearly a quarter of a million sterling to the best advantage. The separate existence of the National Aid Society was protracted until the July of 1905, it having in the meantime relieved the sufferings of many battle-fields at a total expenditure of nearly £500,000. Up to his death in 1901 Lord Wantage took the liveliest interest in all its affairs, representing it as its president in numerous campaigns, and was with difficulty restrained, though visibly near death, from proceeding to South Africa in 1900 to superintend the operations of the society during the Boer War.

Prior to that date, namely in 1898, a kindred organisation had been formed under the title of 'The Central British Red 'Cross Council,' to which, in the January of 1899, the War Office accorded its official recognition. Some three years later, that is towards the end of 1902, this newer society was still further favoured by the government, the Foreign Office notifying to all foreign chancelleries that the British Red Cross Council was

the only body authorised to deal with Red Cross activities throughout the British Empire. Under those circumstances, and owing to the desire of Queen Alexandra that the various relief committees should be reorganised 'on a more practical 'and sound basis,' the National Society agreed to join forces with the Red Cross Council, which, consequently, changed its name to 'The British Red Cross Society' in the July of 1905, exactly thirty-five years subsequent to the foundation of the parent organisation. But in addition to incorporating the National Society the general council of the British Red Cross Society also included among its members representatives of the St. John Ambulance Association, the Army Nursing Service Reserve, and the St. Andrew's Ambulance Association.

Among these accessions the first-named was the most important. Reference has already been made to the good intentions of those St. John members who were contemplating action two years prior to the foundation of the National Society, and it is now necessary to describe briefly the important rôle of the Hospitallers in British Red Cross activity.

Founded in the eleventh century, the Order of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem came into existence, as its name suggests, for the purpose of ministering to the needs of pilgrims to the Holy City, and in less than a century had grown into a powerful and wealthy organisation of Knights Hospitallers. After being ejected from Jerusalem in 1291 the order, in 1309, established its head-quarters in Rhodes, remaining there until 1522, and finding, seven years later, a new locale in Malta, where it abode until its royalist sympathies at the time of the French Revolution led to its destruction in 1798. There was a branch, or langue, of the order in England which, at the time of the capture of Malta, passed into a state of suspended animation, remaining in that condition until 1834, when it was galvanised into a semblance of life by certain supporters of a quixotic project to reconquer Rhodes and re-establish the order in all its ancient glory. Such a 'sham-Gothic restora-'tion of the Romantic period,' however, made little stir in the outer world until a happy thought turned the activities of the Knights of Justice and the Knights of Grace in a direction which connected their picturesque revival with the beneficent object to which the order owed its origin. Had it not been for that good fortune 'The Grand Priory of the Order of the

'Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem in England' would probably have deserved all the satiric scorn which used to be vented upon its high pretensions to knightly ceremonies and distinctions. If, however, some of its members revelled most in their pinchbeck chivalric traditions, the order as a whole was saved from buffoonery by the character of several adherents who were distinguished for philanthropic ideals. That Queen Alexandra consented to become a Lady of Justice in 1876, and that Queen Victoria granted a charter to the order in 1888, were tributes to the new direction given to the organisation by those modern knights errant.

Several of these practical Hospitallers rendered strenuous service during the Franco-German war as representatives of the National Aid Society, and their experience of the lack of prior organisation naturally convinced them of the soundness of M. Dunant's principle that if relief committees are to be of effective service in time of war they must be carefully organised in time of peace. In other words, it was the experience of the knights of St. John, gained during the Franco-German conflict, which prompted them to devise a scheme which would make them more efficient errants of mercy on any future battle-fields.

Yet, such is the enervating influence of peace, that notwithstanding that a member of the order in 1872 gave £100 to establish an ambulance service in mining districts, it was not until 1877 that the St. John Ambulance Association was definitely founded. That was the most notable event in the history of national relief committees. There are, as the charitable are well aware, countless societies which awaken from dormancy or spring into a brief existence when the outbreak of a great war stirs the deeps of human sympathy; but the number of those which pursue their high purpose in the more placid days of peace is exceedingly small. Among those honourable exceptions, however, the St. John Ambulance Association holds the proud distinction of being at once the pioneer and still the most active.

According to the constitution of the Association, its chief object is the 'instruction of persons in rendering first aid in 'case of accident or sudden illness, and in the transport of the 'sick and injured.' Such work, too, was to be carried out 'in 'peace and war, irrespectively of race, class, or creed.' That programme consequently involved theory and practice, or

education and application. For the purpose of instruction, centres were established all over the country for classes in first aid and allied subjects ; and that the lessons there learnt should serve a practical end the St. John Ambulance Brigade was organised. The result is world-famous, for on railways, in coal mines, in factories and workshops, or in the crowded streets where the thousands congregate for royal processions, or on open spaces where mass meetings or football cup-ties attract vast crowds, the men and women of St. John are ever on duty. The chief activity of the Brigade, in fact, is to enrol first-aid certificate holders in a corps which can be 'placed 'at the disposal of the naval, military and other authorities 'as a supplement to the public medical services in case of 'necessity either at home or abroad.' And these ambulance members, it should be noted, by their constant practice in time of peace constitute an invaluable reserve to be drawn upon in time of war to supplement the necessarily inadequate Royal Army Medical Corps.

For example, during the Boer War the St. John policy of having always available a corps ripe in practical experience was triumphantly justified. On the one hand the Brigade supplied auxiliaries to the Royal Army Medical Corps, and on the other it provided numerous orderlies for the private hospitals equipped by the Central British Red Cross Council. Each call from the War Office was answered with commendable alacrity, for on no occasion was there a longer interval than forty-eight hours between the requisition and the response, while more than once the detachments were ready several days before their embarkation arrangements were completed. All told, the Brigade supplied upwards of 2000 men for service in South Africa, sixty-two of whom died at their posts. The value of this assistance to the Royal Army Medical Corps may be estimated from the fact that the proportion of St. John men in that corps was one in four.

Since the incorporation of the National Aid Society with the British Red Cross Council and the re-naming of that organisation as the British Red Cross Society, a further scheme of centralisation has been carried out. This was rendered necessary by the creation of the Territorial Force, and a War Office order of January 1911 recommended the Red Cross Society as the most suitable body for organising Voluntary Aid Detach-

ments supplementary to the medical equipment of the Territorial Force. Perhaps it is not widely known that although the Territorial Force is efficiently equipped with field ambulances, better equipped, indeed, in that respect than the regular army itself, and has a certain number of general hospitals at its command, it is entirely deficient in those units which are the necessary links between mobile ambulances and general hospitals. That is to say, for clearing hospitals, stationary hospitals on lines of communication, and for ambulance trains and rest stations, etc., it has to rely upon the Voluntary Aid Detachments which are organised by the St. John Ambulance Brigade and the British Red Cross Society. Those detachments are absolutely essential for the efficiency of the Territorial Force. And the generous services of their members relieve the nation from that ' intolerable burden of taxation ' which would be imperative if they were not available.

Doubtless it was necessary for the War Office to restrict its recognition to one organisation, but those who approach the study of the relief committee movement without prejudice will doubtless be perplexed to understand why the War Office recognition should have been accorded to the Red Cross Society instead of to the St. John Ambulance Association, bearing in mind the pioneer and theoretical-cum-practical policy of that body. To the honour of the St. John members, however, no jealous complaint has been made ; and at the outbreak of the present war Lord Rothschild was able to announce that the British Red Cross Society was ' working in close harmony with ' the St. John Ambulance Association.'

Between them these two bodies supply the deficiencies of the medical service of the Territorial Force. In harmony with its primary object, to ' furnish aid to the sick and wounded ' in time of war,' the British Red Cross Society, emulating the example of its friendly rival, had covered the country with a network of instructional branches for the holding of classes in first aid, nursing, and hygiene and sanitation. With that educational work was combined efficient organisation in view of an outbreak of war, special attention being devoted to the enrolment of qualified members in the Voluntary Aid Detachments. Hence when war was declared the various counties of England were adequately supplied with service units to supplement the field ambulances of the Territorial

Force, the St. John Ambulance Association and the British Red Cross Society sharing about equally in furnishing those detachments. All this will help to explain why, so far as general publicity goes, the Red Cross Society is less known to the mass than the St. John Ambulance Association, for in time of peace the former body reverts to its educational and organising functions. Each body is alike, however, in making as liberal provision as possible for supplying 'additional 'comforts' to the sick and wounded who may fall to their care. They are alike, too, owing to State recognition, in being entitled to all the privileges accorded to Red Cross societies by international law.

Those privileges are more comprehensive to-day than they were forty years ago, for the Geneva Convention of 1864 has been superseded by the Geneva Convention of 1906. The earlier treaty indeed had only been tested four years when several of its defects and omissions were discovered, the latter including the important oversight of its non-application to naval warfare; but as the revised draft which was prepared in 1868 failed to secure diplomatic approval it never became law. Apart from the Hague agreement of 1899 which made the Convention of 1864 applicable to maritime war, it was not until 1906 that the various efforts to revise the original Convention in harmony with the results of subsequent experience were rewarded with success. This ultimate triumph was due to the persistence of the Swiss Federal Council, which through many disappointments remained loyally faithful to M. Dunant's philanthropic ideals.

One of the most significant features of the conference of 1906 was that the seventy-seven delegates who attended represented no fewer than thirty-seven governments, as compared with the fourteen governments who participated in the conference of 1863, an increase cogently illustrative of the world's progress towards humanitarian ideals. The delegates, whose committee meetings and general discussions were protracted for twenty-five days, included many of the ablest men of their respective countries—diplomats, naval and military officers, army medical officers, international jurists, and members of Red Cross societies. The jurists were naturally conspicuous in the numerous discussions, but perhaps the most potent influence in the conference

was that wielded by the Red Cross representatives, who triumphantly achieved their object of redressing the omissions of the 1864 Convention in relation to voluntary organisations.

When the conference closed on the 6th of July with the formal ceremony of signing the Convention the world learnt that the original treaty of 1864 had been expanded into a document consisting of eight chapters subdivided into thirty-three articles.

Doubtless the unreflecting sentimentalist will maintain that the withdrawal by the Convention of 1906 of the privileges accorded in 1864 to non-combatants who succoured the wounded was a shamefully retrograde decision. Yet it was by the unanimous vote of the conference that the rights of neutrality and other exemptions enjoyed by those non-combatants were wholly abolished. The reason advanced was all-sufficient: universal experience had shown that that provision had been grossly abused by non-combatants utilising the wounded for their own protection instead of exerting themselves to supply their wants. In place of that article, however, the Convention conferred upon a competent officer the freedom to 'appeal to the charitable zeal' of non-combatants for help in collecting and tending fallen soldiers. But surely such a provision was unnecessary, for a commander-in-chief has unlimited power to requisition the assistance of the civil population. In this connection it may be regretted that the Convention afforded no protection to non-combatants who may be wounded within the radius of a battle-field or while peacefully dwelling in a besieged city; such blameless victims of war are wholly debarred from the benefits conferred upon belligerents.

In the present connection it will be appropriate that most attention should be given to those articles of the Convention which relate to Voluntary Aid Societies; yet before giving a summary of such articles it may be useful to notice several other innovations, especially as some officers do not seem to have a clear idea of the changes effected in 1906.

Among minor changes the words 'neutral' and 'neutrality' were abandoned in favour of such expressions as 'respected' 'taken care of' and 'protected,' while a further alteration in phraseology substituted 'mobile medical units' for

'ambulances,' and 'fixed establishments' for 'hospitals.' What the Convention defined as a 'mobile medical unit' is now known in the British army as a 'field ambulance,' that is, the entire service accompanying a moving army for the collection and first treatment of the wounded.

Far more important were the articles imposing new and even onerous duties on commanders-in-chief. In cases when a general finds it necessary to abandon his wounded he is expected, 'as far as military exigencies permit,' to leave with them a part of his medical personnel and *matériel*; if, however, he is victorious and remains in possession of the field, it is incumbent upon him to search for the wounded, and to protect both wounded and dead against maltreatment and pillage. His duty to the dead goes further: there must be a 'careful 'examination' of their bodies before they are buried or cremated, and the articles found upon those bodies, including identification marks and all valuables and letters, are to be collected and returned as soon as possible to the proper authorities. Each belligerent is also to supply his enemy with a 'nominal roll' of the wounded or sick in his hands. Apart from their receiving adequate medical attention, all wounded and sick falling into the hands of the enemy are to be regarded as prisoners of war unless some mutual arrangement to the contrary is effected; on the other hand, the personnel of the medical units are not to be treated as prisoners of war, but to be 'respected and protected under all circumstances.'

Reference has been made above to the fact that the Convention of 1864 paid not the slightest attention to the voluntary aid societies, but inasmuch as in every war subsequent to that date those societies had rendered invaluable assistance to the military authorities, it was unanimously agreed to make an attempt to define and legalise their position. One delegate, indeed, pleaded for the specific naming of the orders of Malta and St. John, but the conference wisely decided to confine itself to such general principles as could be applied to all organisations alike. In harmony with that policy it was resolved that:

'The personnel of Voluntary Aid Societies, duly recognised and authorised by their Government, who may be employed in the medical units and establishments of the armies, is placed on the same footing as the personnel of the armies, provided always that

the first-mentioned personnel shall be subject to military law and regulations.'

'Each State shall notify to the other, either in time of peace or at the commencement of or during the course of hostilities, but in every case before employing them, the names of the Societies which it has authorised, under State responsibility, to render assistance to the regular medical service of its armies.'

These articles, however, apply only to the voluntary aid societies of the actual belligerents. What about those societies of neutral countries which may be anxious to participate in ameliorating the horrors of war? Their sympathetic aspirations were not ignored; on the contrary, the Convention provided that all recognised societies of neutral countries should be entitled to the protection of the treaty provided they secured the consent of their own government and the authorisation of the belligerent they elected to assist. In other words, if the National American Red Cross Society wished to succour the wounded of Great Britain it would require to obtain the consent of its own government and then the approval of the British Army Council.

From the foregoing it will be seen that the *modus operandi* of every relief committee is as follows: Whatever its preliminary preparations in personnel and *matériel*, it must at the outset secure the official recognition of its government, and even then cannot begin its merciful work until its name and the fact of its authorisation have been communicated to the Power with which its government is at war. Such regulations are absolutely necessary. Apart altogether from those spurious philanthropists who try to utilise a time of war for their own social aggrandisement or pecuniary profit, the genuine and disinterested offers of assistance at such a time are so overwhelming that if they were not co-ordinated there would be lamentable waste and overlapping. Hence the wisdom of the Army Council in designating one organisation —the British Red Cross Society—as the clearing-house for all charitable donations.

Under the conditions noted above, every relief committee, no matter what its name, passes at once into the Red Cross category. For when the conference of 1906 addressed itself to the question of the distinctive emblem to be used by army and voluntary medical services alike, it was unanimously decided that, 'as a compliment to Switzerland,' the device of a

red cross on a white ground should be retained, and a special resolution was adopted to the effect that ' the Red Cross has no ' religious significance.' Among the non-Christian delegations, that of Japan raised no objection to the emblem, which had been generally used by Japanese nurses during the Russo-Japanese war ; but the Chinese, Persian, and Siamese representatives abstained from voting. Later in the conference the delegates from Siam announced that their government accepted the Red Cross as the distinctive emblem for all medical units, but the Persian envoy reserved that article when signing the Convention, while Turkey claimed the right to substitute the Red Crescent for the Red Cross. After postulating that the Red Cross should be displayed on the flags and armlets of the medical services, and also that it should be applied to the *matériel*, the conference agreed that the armlet or brassard should be ' fixed ' to the left arm, that it should be stamped and issued only by a competent military officer, and that when worn by anyone not in military uniform it should be accompanied by a certificate of identification. This regulation, by the way, seems to be contravened by the position of the Red Cross on the uniform authorised by the British Red Cross Society, for in that costume, whether for men or women, the Red Cross is displayed on a shield which is fixed to the left breast instead of the left arm of the wearer. The conference purposely avoided giving any rigid definition of the Red Cross, in order to prevent any slight variation being used to claim exemption from any penalty attached to its abuse ; but Hungary had tackled the problem boldly in its protective law of 1889, wherein the emblem was expressly defined as ' five red squares of equal size placed in juxta-' position in the form of a cross on a white background.'

Extreme measures were taken by the conference to guard against the abuse of the Red Cross, for in addition to prohibiting the use of the emblem or the words ' Red Cross ' in peace or war save for the protection or identification of the medical services, whether military or voluntary, it pledged the signatory governments to pass, if they did not already possess, legislation adequate to protect the Red Cross from abuse by unauthorised individuals or societies, or as a trademark for commercial purposes. Such legislation was unanimously agreed to be necessary, and at the present time most

of the leading nations have on their statute-books laws designed to achieve the purpose of the 1906 Convention. For any unauthorised use of the Red Cross, Austria imposes a fine of from 2 to 200 crowns with imprisonment for six hours or fourteen days, Belgium a penalty not exceeding 25 francs and seven days' imprisonment, Germany a fine not exceeding 150 marks, and the United States either imprisonment for not more than a year or a fine varying from one to 500 dollars. By the British Geneva Convention Act of 1911 it is provided that it is 'not 'lawful for any person to use for the purposes of his trade or 'business, or for any other purpose whatsoever, without the 'authority of the Army Council, the heraldic emblem of the 'Red Cross or the words "Red Cross" or "Geneva Cross."' These laws are no doubt sufficient for times of peace, but it appears to have baffled the wit of man to prevent those far more criminal abuses of the Red Cross which sully the history of every war.

Despite those abuses, however, the Red Cross stands for a record of mercy perhaps without parallel in the annals of human sympathy. Some of its chapters have been written, but they are fragmentary compared with those inscribed in the grateful memories of thousands rescued from the agony of battle-fields. In many lonely, far-scattered graves, too, is eternally hidden the story of how their occupants' last moments were soothed by a kindly knight of the Red Cross. And if, as is just, the discerning can catch a glimpse of 'the Lady of 'the Lamp' hovering over the well-tended beds in our military hospitals, it is surely time that by the side of every Red Cross envoy there should be recognised the gracious figure of the philanthropist of Geneva.

HENRY C. SHELLEY.

LIFE IN CROATIA

1. **The Balkan Peninsula.** By EMILE DE LAVELEYE. Fisher Unwin. 1887.
2. **La Hongrie Moderne (1849–1901).** By A. DE BERTHA. Paris. 1901.
3. **L'Equilibre Adriatique.** By CHARLES LOISEAU. Paris. 1901.
4. **The Future of Austria-Hungary and the Attitude of the Great Powers.** By R. W. SETON-WATSON. Constable. 1907.
5. **The Southern Slav Question and the Hapsburg Monarchy.** By R. W. SETON-WATSON. Constable. 1911.

'From the Tatra to the Black Mountain, from the Giant Alps to the Urals, resound the words—"Heaven for the Slavs."'

IN spite of Magyar denial, Croatia is historically an independent kingdom, linked only to Hungary, as Hungary is linked to Austria, through the person of the Hapsburg monarch. Its people are still inspired by recollections of their independence in the eleventh century, and by later recollections of the victorious army led by the Croatian patriot Jellachich in 1848. They are filled with hopes of national liberty and with ambition; they wish to expand northwards into Hungary, westwards into Cisleithan Austria, and on the south to absorb Dalmatia and Bosnia. Before the present war began, their main object was to substitute Trialism for Dualism in the Austrian Empire. It is more than probable that most of them are now hoping for national freedom outside of the Austro-Hungarian dominions.

The Austro-Hungarian province of Croatia-Slavonia lies between Austria proper on the north-west, Hungary on the north-east, and Bosnia and Servia on the south. It possesses a population of 2,400,000, all pure Slavs belonging to the great family which has Russia for its head. They are divided into two tribes, namely the Serbo-Croats, or Serbs, and the Croats proper, both of whom speak the Serbo-Croatian language. This language has three main dialects and is written in two different characters, the Croats using the Latin alphabet, the

Serbs the Cyrillic, as reformed by Vuk Karadzic. The province is composed of two portions, differing widely from each other in character, the Croatia of the plains and the Croatia of the mountains. The first, or north-eastern district, comprises broad fertile plains, rich with vines and luxuriant foliage, sheltered here and there with beech and oak forests, where great herds of swine find abundant provision. It lies between the rivers Drave and Save, extending from Friedan in Styria and Rann in Carniola as far as the frontier town of Semlin, which faces Belgrade across the river. The second, or south-western district, is a lofty, desolate, but exceedingly beautiful highland region connecting the mountain system of the Balkans with the Karst above Trieste. It descends suddenly into the Adriatic at Fiume. The capital of Croatia is Zágrêb (Agram), which in English means 'beyond the rocks.' It overlooks the river Save from a height on the spurs of the Styrian Alps and has 80,000 inhabitants.

The natural beauties of Croatia are unsurpassed. In the mountainous portion of the country mighty snow-capped peaks rise tier upon tier, their lower slopes descending into great, lonely, primeval forests of pine, fir, and oak. Exquisite little lakes, reflecting a thousand tints, fringed with ferns and strange mosses, streams which clatter and dash over big grey boulders, offer a home to pink-speckled trout and grayling. In the forests and on the heights all sorts of game and wild things abound—marmots, polecats, chamois, bears, roebuck, wild boar, golden eagles, vultures. Those who love sport will find Croatia a veritable paradise. The peasants are all born hunters, hunting being their favourite amusement.

And Croatia of the plains is not less lovely. There is a fascination about the wide landscape devoid of the hedges, walls and all artificial obstacles, which give English scenery a garden-like aspect. Great open spaces, swept clean by the wind, stretch for miles and miles under a brilliant blue sky. For, however cold it may be in winter, the sky is, generally speaking, cloudless, and the atmosphere is always clear and bracing. In May when the young vines uncurl and shed fragrance, and the fields are purple with millions of violets giving out an almost overpowering sweetness, when the forests are carpeted with snowdrops, it is a delight merely to breathe. But, if beautiful at this season, the plains are even lovelier in

June when the rose plantations are in full bloom, when fuchsias and geraniums glow in the hot sunshine, and a thousand different species of wild flowers, many of which are not found outside this region, blaze in a perfect riot of colour. The perfume and beauty of a Croatian midsummer day or night can never fade from the memory of those fortunate enough to have enjoyed it. Wild mignonette, great scarlet poppies, blue and heliotrope corn-flowers, snapdragon, lilies, orchids, harebells, stonepinks, wild thyme—these are only a few of the best known flowers which blossom so profusely. There are others strange enough to attract botanists, who would discover here a whole country seemingly planted out for their inspection.

The people inhabiting the mountainous portion of Croatia are tall in stature and dark-complexioned; in temperament they are sullen, revengeful and brave. They come of the race which produced that famous and terrible corps of Croatian volunteers called 'the Pandurs,' which fought through the wars of succession against Maria Theresa and the Empire. Clad as to-day in Oriental dress, with fez and streaming red mantle, carrying the horse-tail and crescent in lieu of colours, they rushed to the slaughter of their enemies, and according to Germanic legend committed terrible crimes on defenceless peoples. Peaceful Bavarians and the simple peasantry of the Rhine valley still frighten their children into obedience with the threat—'Hush! if you are not good the Pandurs 'will come and eat you.' The hillmen wear closely fitting small caps, black, red or green embroidered zouaves, red or blue baggy trousers gathered at the knee, gorgeously coloured mantles or sheep-skins, and sandals of untanned cowhide. Every article of their attire, even their underlinen, is richly embroidered and braided with multicoloured silks and wools. Their zouaves and jackets are heavy with innumerable silver and zinc buttons, and their belts, ten or eleven inches wide, are of leather studded with silver bosses. In these belts they carry their inseparable companions, long curved knives with embossed silver hilts, pistols, and cartridge boxes. Frequently, too, they are armed with long, silver-mounted rifles. The hill women are also tall and strong, perhaps somewhat over robust in figure for perfect female beauty, but with soft, sombre faces, showing their passionate proclivities only in the slumberous depths of their dark eyes.

But so calm and gentle are they in movement and speech, that it is difficult to believe them to be as truly daughters of the house of Mars as are their sister Slavs the Montenegrins. They wear short and very full linen or woollen skirts gathered into their waists in many heavy folds, and embroidered at every seam with blue, scarlet or green cross-stitch. From their shoulders hang short pieces of gaily coloured cloth, decorated with patches of silk or leather sewn on in the geometrical designs so dear to Croat taste. On their heads are caps, flat or pointed in form, over which are folded brilliantly coloured kerchiefs. Their necks are entwined with rows upon rows of beads of all colours and sizes, and in their belts of embroidered linen or canvas they also carry knives. A highland woman's married or single state is advertised by the colour of her stockings. A girl wears white; a married woman, blue; and a widow, red.

On the sea-facing slopes of the mountains live the Uskoks. These people may be classified as mountain folk as well as seafarers. They are descended from the dreaded pirates who once had their dwelling amongst the lower hills overlooking the Adriatic, and waged a desultory warfare against the republic of Venice. To-day they are recognised as one of the finest seafaring races in Europe, and the cream of the Austro-Hungarian navy is recruited from them.

On leaving the mountains and descending to the plains the people, like the climate, change. Faces become softer, thinner, sadder, more patient, complexions become fairer, blue eyes take the place of black. The dress also alters. The men of the plains wear broad-brimmed black hats as often as caps. Coloured breeches and heavy mantles are replaced by garments of white homespun linen. No matter what the weather may be or how muddy the roads or soiling their work, the Croatian lowlanders never discard their white clothes; yet they seldom appear bedraggled or dirty. The whiteness of the peasant's clothes is one of the remarkable things in this strange country. Long white linen trousers and loose, sleeveless linen shirts open at the breast are the principal articles of a lowlander's costume. In winter brilliantly coloured zouaves keep the intense cold from striking the lungs; and when the temperature falls more than usual below zero, thick black coats or sheep-skins are worn.

The lowlanders, like the highlanders, wear wide belts ornamented with red woollen tassels and silver; but the article on which they lavish the most attention and affection is the 'torba,' an enormous pouch, at least two feet wide each way, made of finely woven horse-hair embroidered with scarlet and silver thread, and edged with a sweeping fringe of horse-hair, red silk and silver tassels. From his 'torba' no self-respecting man will part either by night or day. It is the receptacle of all his personal treasures—wooden pipes, money, papers, religious emblems, provisions, cards, dice (for the Croatian who is not an inveterate gambler is still unborn), and, last but not least, his flask of 'Slivovicza,' a kind of brandy distilled from the fruit of the prune trees which border the roads for miles throughout Croatia.

The women of the plains when clustered together in groups give the impression of a summer garden in full blossom. Their short white linen skirts, reaching barely to their knees, are drawn into multitudinous gathers at the waist, and are so stiff with starch as to stick out almost horizontally like the conventional dress of the ballet dancer. White linen aprons embroidered with blue or red thread are worn over the skirts, and help to conceal the assortment of comestibles that the women generally carry in their skirts—cakes, fat bacon, sausages, black bread, and little flasks of 'Slivovicza.' They exchange these delicacies with one another on greeting. Their head-dress consists of broad flat caps or white silk kerchiefs, worn as Turkish turbans over well-smoothed hair. Their brightly coloured zouaves are plentifully bedecked with beads and buttons, while on their hands they display as many heavy silver rings as their fingers will hold. On high days and holidays their ivory clear cheeks are rouged with some home-made vegetable cosmetic, and their silky hair brought into sleek submission by the application of goose fat.

In the lowlands the costume of the men is the same both for Serbs and Croats; but the Serb women can easily be distinguished from the Croat women by their extraordinary garments. Their chief article of clothing is a white linen chemise which is slipped on over the head, has no fastening, and is slit up each side seam to above the knee. This chemise is confined round the waist by a heavy silver-adorned leather belt, and into these belts, when snow is falling or the roads are

muddy, the women tuck the lower half of their chemises, oblivious of the fact that, having no undergarments whatever, they are exposing their persons both to the public and to the weather. But however much they may ignore the comfort of the lower half of their bodies, the Serb women are extremely careful about the treatment of their shoulders and heads. The former they cover with a thick yellow frieze jacket gorgeously embroidered in every colour imaginable ; the latter they contrive to make as ugly as possible by dragging every hair out of sight, and folding vivid scarlet or yellow kerchiefs across their foreheads, tying the ends into two outstanding points behind the ears. The Serbs and Croats of both sexes wear untanned cowhide sandals, laced to their ankles over linen swathings or white wool socks.

While the traveller is noting these peculiarities of Croatian costume, he will have had time to discover that the Hungarian government, through fear and hatred of the Slavs, deliberately prevents the progress of the country. The service of the State railways is arranged of set purpose to confine Croatian trade to Hungary and hinder its development elsewhere. Even communication with Vienna is made difficult, for the Magyars are afraid of the Austrians coming to an understanding with the Slavs. In other respects the railways are most inconvenient, for the station is usually a considerable distance from the town it serves, and the road connecting the town with the station is as a rule appallingly bad. The hotels are worse, except in Zágréb, the capital. But tourists who can face discomfort will find in Croatia an unspoilt country and an unvulgarised people, a wealth of historical interest and unexplored riches of natural beauty and romance. These are no small compensations for lack of luxury.

The best way to see the country is to live with a Croat family. Native hospitality is almost unlimited, and a letter of introduction from a consul to any local magnate, doctor, priest, or lawyer secures the stranger a welcome. The domestic life of the Croats in most respects bears the impress of primitive simplicity. There is but little difference among the classes ; a gentleman's household is conducted much in the same way as a respectable farmer's or peasant's. No one is rich, and if incomes were balanced, it would be found that the peasants are frequently better off than the

gentry. There is a poorer class known as ' the little peasants,' descendants of the former serfs, and their poverty is extreme. The patriarchal system though declining in all classes still exists, and it is customary for all the branches of a peasant family to occupy the same house. The affairs are conducted by a chief, generally the grandfather or oldest male member, who manages the family property. His patriarchal sway is supreme. He has absolute control over the accounts, and orders the labour of the males, while his wife, or the oldest woman in the home, sees to the well-being and industry of the women and girls. The head of a family is called the ' Gospoda,' and these heads of households often meet together for consultation on village affairs. A Croatian family is, in fact, a kind of primitive association in which the members have all things in common ; and a Croatian village may be described as a similar association on a larger scale. Scarcely acquainted even by hearsay with the refinements and comforts of modern life, the Croats are simple in their habits and have but few wants.

A large country farm-house may be taken as an example of a typical Croatian home wherein dwell several branches of one family. The house is large, airy, and as a rule one-storeyed. The foundations are of wooden blocks raised two or three feet above the level of the ground, and there is generally a rough verandah encircling the whole building. The house itself is built of either wood or clay. Its front door leads into the ' great room ' which corresponds to the great hall of our forefathers. This is the apartment used by all members of the family for meals, work, or recreation. In the corner stands a gigantic open stove over which, even in summer, hangs suspended an immense pot of water, which serves for the preparation of food. The floor is made of stamped earth. Great smoke-blackened rafters supporting the roof act as shelves for crockery —which is very beautiful in Croatia—and knives and forks are stuck in niches. The windows are small and have neither blinds nor curtains. A big carved table occupies the centre of this living room, and round the walls stand towering, heavily carved, chests and unyielding wooden chairs. A basket filled with blocks of wood is placed near the stove ; coal is never used, and when the terrible winter comes on, strangers are apt to find even the largest wood fires insufficient for comfort. Wood-chopping

is a heavy winter labour, and is often relegated with other disagreeable tasks to the women. Masculine Croatia dislikes wood-chopping. A story is told of a Croatian farm-house where the female inmates consisted of an old bedridden grandmother and some small girls. As no women were available for chopping the wood the difficulty was solved by pulling an entire but slender pine tree across the floor of the living room, one end of the tree being placed on the hearth, while the other end remained on the verandah; as the tree was consumed it was pulled gradually into the house. The kitchen opens out of the living room. Here again the stove is open, and round the walls hang sausages, dried pig-meat, bacon sides, whilst from the rafters are suspended any number of sheep, cheeses, bunches of garlic and onions. On the wall near the stove, basking and gurgling in the warmth, usually dangle one or two pillow-encased babies. Round the walls stand big jars of gherkins, and sacks of meal, of which gigantic loaves are baked in a wicker basket under a heap of live charcoal. In the centre of every Croatian table is an earthenware pitcher of spring water, for Croats are tremendous water drinkers. In the kitchen also are at least two large oak bedsteads, and in winter other large beds are brought into the living room and kitchen from the bedrooms. These two apartments become the sleeping places of the married members of the family, the unmarried folk accommodating themselves in the stove corners or in byres and stables, where they huddle up for warmth in their smelly sheep-skins as closely as possible to their dumb companions. In a Croat bedroom there is little save the beds, the marriage chest attached to each double bed, and the family weaving loom. In every room and over the entrance door is a crucifix, and ikons and religious pictures decorate the walls, which are composed of yellow baked clay. A dairy is attached to one side of the house, and in it are stored many and strange articles, field implements, washing-tubs, baskets used in vintage times, casks of wine, tall churns and butter-making necessities. Cream is churned fresh every morning and the butter placed to cool in water for some hours, then beaten, and, lastly, boiled and seasoned and sent to the market. Cream cheeses peculiar to Croatia are flavoured with caraway seeds, sage, and invariably with garlic. Garlic is never absent in this land. From the time one crosses the frontier till one recrosses it, the smell of garlic

haunts one's throat, one's nostrils, hands, and clothes. All food has abandoned its own flavour for that of garlic! A Croat house reeks of smoke and—garlic!

Croatia is first and foremost an agricultural country, and its wealth consists in cattle of all kinds, especially swine. Bullocks are employed to do the heavy work on the land. The native horses are small and swift and are harnessed into carts and carriages three in a row, decked out in gorgeous red and yellow trappings with bells. Bees are kept by every peasant family, but up to the present bee-keeping has been conducted on very primitive lines.

Whatever may be said of Croatian men, the women cannot be accused of indolence. They not only perform all the duties of the house, dairy, and garden, but even feed the cattle and horses and clean the harness. They also undertake the heaviest part of the field labour and vintage gathering, and do the buying and selling at the fairs. It is amusing, if irritating, to watch the men of a household start on an expedition townwards. They never stir till the women have laced their sandals on their lordly feet, buttoned up their sheep-skins, filled their 'torbas' with necessaries and dainties, and, lastly, placed the whips in their hands, which is the signal that the carts and horses, already harnessed by the women, are ready.

These duties are only some of the feminine occupations. The women provide all the clothing for the household, including the wonderfully beautiful embroideries. They shear the sheep, dress, spin, dye, and weave the wool or hemp; they sow and gather the flax, steep, dry, spin, weave, and bleach the linen. A weaving loom is in every house, and at this the women are continually employed during the winter months when the weather stops outdoor labour. As the 'torba' with its cards and dice contains never-failing occupation for the men, so the distaff affords endless employment to the women. Wherever they go they carry it with them in their girdles, ready whenever an idle moment presents itself to turn the spindle and drag out the thread.

All Slavs love beauty for its own sake, and one of the things which strike a stranger most forcibly is the artistic appearance of Croat homes. Even their earthenware pots, their wooden chairs, and agricultural implements are beautiful. The dyes they employ are of extraordinary brilliancy and softness, and

are extracted from saffron, willow bark, and the wild pear tree. Their embroideries are worked in characteristic geometrical designs without a frame and follow, according to the experts who have but lately begun to realise the artistic value of Southern Slav needlework, the Byzantine and Holbein techniques. Their coarse linen and fine cambrics are prepared according to the same process as ancient stuffs discovered in Egyptian tombs. Not only their ornaments, but their knives and spinning-wheels, their furniture, rifles, carts, and tools are all skilfully carved and painted. Even the poorest peasant is an instinctive artist. The gorgeous East has touched the land, and at a fair or fête the crowd appears like a rich and varied symphony in colour.

The national appreciation of colour and form is equalled by the national love of music. The world has been made familiar with Croatian music under the name of Hungarian; for the so-called Hungarian melodies and folk songs are, generally speaking, Slavonic-Croatian in origin, and have merely been altered, not for the better, by Magyar plagiarists. The Magyars rob Croatia of more than national freedom and money; they rob her of artistic reputation. In Budapest Croatian embroidery, jewellery, carving, and pottery are sold as Hungarian. Even Brahms and Liszt were not above pilfering from the southern Slavonic music, and Lehar, with whose talent Vienna, New York, and London are so familiar, has founded one of his best works—'Der Rasttelbinder'—on Southern Slavonic airs. The gipsies of Hungary, popularly regarded as the guardians of Magyar music, have probably most largely plundered from the Croatian folk melodies and dances.

Pure Croatian music has a character entirely its own, full of originality and subtle charm. It is scarcely ever heard in its original purity and perfection beyond the frontier of its native country. Indeed it is heard to the best advantage in the most out-of-the-way villages, in farm-houses, at fairs and at rural fêtes. During the long winter evenings the inmates of adjoining farm-houses gather together after supper, sometimes in one house, sometimes in another. The men sit on one side of the room, the women on the other occupying themselves with some kind of needlework or carving. The buzz of conversation is stilled every now and then when one of

the company breaks into song. Such songs! Wild, passionate, softly plaintive, breathing distress and melancholy for the past and present national troubles of Croatia and the Slav race, pulsating with feverish and deep sentiments—with misty aspirations and hopes for the future. It is easy to imagine the fervour awakened in impulsive Croat hearts by these exquisite folk songs, which invariably point to the day when the brave, long-suffering Slavs will rise and free themselves from tyranny and oppression, whether the oppression be Austrian, Magyar, or Turkish. Every note of Croatian music echoes the wail of a long downtrodden race, recounts ancient glories, and sings of the coming of a splendid day which will dawn either under the banner of Austria-Hungary or under that of a Pan-Slavonic Empire with Constantinople for its capital. They have two objects upon which they lavish all their love and devotion. One is the Christ; the other is their nation. Towards the patient carved Figure on the rough cross which dominates every poor hearth they look for sympathy in life and support in death, and towards the red, white and blue ensign—the Croatian colours—hanging beneath the crucifix they gaze in ever-growing determination to secure national liberty.

The superiority of the music of these Southern Slavs even over that of Russia lies in the fact that they are a people who are more than equal to the Russians and Poles in susceptibility to poetic sentiment, and their songs and dances possess therefore a strange and entrancing note of melancholy. Croat dances and songs are nearly always in the minor key. They are unquestionably original. Croats prefer to improvise both music and words as they sing. Only the ancient national melodies do they leave unchanged, and these may be called the ritual songs which have been handed down by oral tradition through centuries. The most celebrated of these is perhaps the one which they chant on St. John's night, when the peasants leap through the fires on the hill-tops and call upon the heathen goddess 'Lado.' The national hymn of Croatia—'Liepa 'nasa domovina'—is modern and was composed by a young Croatian officer—Josip Runjanin. Drinking songs are most curious and beautiful. Like those of the Serbs they are grave, even prayerful, and some of them have actually been appropriated by other nationalities to reappear as hymns!

For example, Haydn was a Croatian and his famous German song 'Gott erhalte,' the national anthem of Austria, is neither more nor less than a drinking song of his own country people, a song especially sung by the Slavs round about Bistritz.

When the present ever-growing Illyrian movement took life, a school of Croatian music was founded at Zágréb under the direction of the most famous national musicians, and in 1846 the modern world suddenly awakened to a realisation of the beauty of Vatroslar Lisinski's Croatian opera 'Ljubovi-zlova.' Before his advent Croatian composers had unpatriotically sunk their nationality in that of more powerful nations; but Lisinski won fame honestly and proudly as a Croat.

There is considerable difficulty about transmitting this Slav music to paper exactly as it is sung or played; for it is based generally on ancient modes, and the intervals cannot easily be modified by the truly musical ear; while again it possesses notes which it is impossible to reproduce in our notation. Consequently, without an intimate knowledge of the ancient modes, Croat-Slavonic melodies cannot be harmonised. But anyone who, in this age of searching after novelties and beauty, sets himself or herself to the task of mastering this difficulty, and to collecting and publishing these beautiful Croatian songs and dances, will earn the praise and gratitude of all true lovers of music and poetry.

Though warm-hearted and passionate, the Croats seldom marry for love. Love is one thing, marriage another, and the one does not interfere with the other. There is no strict standard of morality in Croatia. Croats love like birds, like the innocent animals. To have lovers, or to have none, is entirely a question of individual temperament, of individual attraction, whether before or after marriage. Lovers occasionally, but rarely, marry; and married people seldom take the trouble to investigate one another's *affaires de cœur*. Divorce is easily obtained, but it is easier still to avoid all expense and unpleasantness by refraining from awkward inquiries. Marriage is a business arrangement built on the solid foundations of partnership and cash. Marriageable maidens are termed 'saleable daughters,' and eligible bachelors 'purchasing 'young men'; the highest bidder secures the girl.

On a day previous to the betrothal the bridegroom and his best man call at the door of the bride's home and inform the inmates that they are seeking a beautiful star to guide them through the night. Whereupon the bride who is not far away runs to her room and her intended bridegroom exclaims—'Why, there is the star we seek!' Then he offers flowers to the family, and the bride returns to be asked by her parents whether she is willing to accept her suitor. Of course she replies in the affirmative.

During the interval between this private ceremony and the public betrothal it is customary in many districts of Croatia for the two affianced persons, if they should meet in public, to fly from each other as if from the plague. They dare not meet one another's gaze, or ill luck will surely follow the marriage. On the betrothal day the bridegroom's 'Gospoda' sends the girl an apple filled with gold and silver coins as a contribution to her 'dot.' He also presents each female member of her family with a gift of wearing apparel which, needless to say, entails a considerable tax on his resources.

On the wedding day the bridal procession proceeds to church early in the morning headed by a sort of fool or clown clad half in female, half in male dress, with a goose wing stuck in his hat. This post is always filled by the wittiest and merriest individual of the community. After him comes the bride dressed all in dazzling white linen, over which she wears a coquettish blue and silver embroidered zouave laden with big silver buttons. Her hair floats loosely down and is entwined with flowers and silver tinsel. On her head is a very lofty crown of imitation red and pink roses spangled over with silver tinsel, and hung all round with long streamers of red roses, silver beads, and ribbons. If she belongs to the Roman faith she carries a rosary; if a member of the Greek Church she holds a bouquet. (The majority of Croatians proper belong to the Roman Church, while Serbo-Croats belong to the Greek Church.) The bride's neck is loaded with beads and often with her dowry in golden pieces. Behind her walk her girl friends looking like bright red and white posies, arm linked in arm, their short white skirts swaying and rustling proudly. Then comes the bridegroom on horseback, dressed also in white linen, with red, blue and white ribbons dangling from his hat. Over his white garments he wears a crimson zouave,

which he has put on for the first time at the door of the bride's house.

Every district in Croatia has its own particular wedding customs, but nearly all of them include the bride race and the ceremony of 'putting the cap on' the bride. Before the wedding feast begins the bride starts out to run from one given point to another, and the bridegroom and his best man make after her in pursuit. If the bridegroom catches her first the best man has to stand the expense of all wine drunk at the wedding feast; if the latter is successful, the bridegroom has to do all the paying. The 'capping' or hair binding ceremony takes place at midnight, when the assembled matrons accompany the bride to her room, remove her crown, pin up her flowing hair, and put on her the kerchief worn after the fashion usual for married women. Then a young cock is caught and decapitated outside the bride's window, after which the bridegroom is summoned and given full possession of his new wife.

Wedding festivities are kept up for at least three or four days. During this time guests do not think of going to bed. Should strangers chance to call during the festivities, the bride herself makes them welcome and presents them with the loving cup—a gigantic vessel filled with Croatian wine—after tasting of which the visitors are invited to take seats at the table, when they are again expected to drink the health of the bride and bridegroom in a glass of the famous old native wine celebrated from time immemorial for its delicious flavour and sweetness. This is made from the vines introduced into the country by the Roman emperor Probus in the third century, and planted by his followers in the district around Mitrovits.

At the end of the third or fourth day the company departs homewards, rolling, laughing, singing, apparently not a whit the worse for their prolonged merry-making, and never ill-humoured. The Croats seem able to imbibe any quantity of alcohol without injurious consequences, and they rarely quarrel when out for enjoyment. One seldom sees a Croatian in a dangerous and nasty temper except when politics are under discussion, when even the most amiable become bellicose. In this they differ from their brothers, the pure-blooded Serbians, who invariably go out of their way to pick quarrels.

Baptisms, deaths, and religious fêtes are all celebrated with somewhat exhausting vigour in Croatia. Holidays seem to occur every few days. A quaint and rather beautiful custom is observed in some districts on Easter Monday, when the cemeteries are visited by the entire community *en masse*. The priests march out in full canonicals surrounded by their little red-frocked acolytes and offer prayers for the souls of the departed. When the service is ended they go in procession round the graves, sprinkling holy water on each as they pass, and the people follow bearing lighted candles, bunches of spring flowers, and other pathetic little souvenirs. A widowed mother brings a lock of her child's hair to lay on its father's grave, or a girl carries a piece of new ribbon to place on the grass above her dead companion. Oranges and apples, letters and little religious books are placed upon the graves. Relatives kneeling on the ground whisper to the dead all that has occurred during the year; even the most trivial gossip is murmured with sobs and tears through the six feet of clay.

On every side one overhears plaintive appeals—'Oh! why 'did you leave us so soon, Beloved? We need you, little '*Jagoda*.* Your clothes are still beautiful and good and would 'have endured yet many years. Darling, your bed is still 'warm, your cup still has milk in it; why did you depart?'

At sunset the mourners dry their tears with the philosophy and faith of true Slavs, call good-night to their departed ones, and troop homeward to end the day and forget their pain, as Slavs have learnt to do through the long sad centuries of their racial agony, in dancing and song. Had these people in bygone ages been gifted with less inconsequent natures there would have been but few brave patriots to-day to fight the battle of the oppressed Slavonic race throughout Europe.

When Croats meet on the streets they greet one another with the salutation 'Jesus Christ is alive and reigns!' To which the person addressed replies—'Yes, He lives and reigns 'for ever and ever.' A lady is met with the words—'I kiss 'your hand, honourable lady.' In the case of a married woman the assurance is literally carried out; in the case of a girl the formula is only figurative. Pagan traditions still survive. Sometimes at dinner the master of the household offers a libation

* Strawberry, a pet name in Croatia.

of wine ' to the other gods.' Again, when a person dies the members of the family knock three times on each wall to let the household gods know that someone has departed, and then make a great noise in order to prevent the spirit haunting the house. The dead are always dressed up in fine clothes, and old women toil for hours daily embroidering winding sheets for themselves, which are in most cases veritable works of art. Among other quaint customs may be noted the practice of betrothed young men who seek out their promised brides and deluge them with either buckets of cold water or perfume squirts till induced to desist by a present of coloured eggs.

Beggars are much respected everywhere, and as there is no poor law, begging is systematised. The beggars form a community in themselves. In each village or district they elect a king or queen whose duty it is to assign ' beats ' to their fellows, to receive and distribute moneys collected, and to smooth over bickerings. The beggars have each certain houses to call at where they receive a fixed sum, generally a couple of kreutzers, which is given ' in the name of Jesus Christ ' the King.' There are special beggars who stand at church doors. There are others who come out only on fête and saints' days ; others again levy a contribution on their richer neighbours who happen to possess the same name. An idiot is entitled to beg both day and night everywhere.

Ignorance has been up to now the instrument which Austria-Hungary has employed to hinder Slavonic progress within the Dual Monarchy. But this instrument has broken in the hands of politicians and ecclesiastics. Forced emigration has brought enlightenment. Croats and Dalmatians have for years been steadily leaving their homeland to seek employment and liberty in foreign countries. Many of them become sailors, and especially are they fond of sailing under the British flag. In many of the coast villages and not a few of the inland towns a large proportion of inhabitants speak English quite as well as they do their native tongue. Indeed, in some of the inland towns English is the language generally spoken, the inhabitants having emigrated to America, Canada, New Zealand, or Australia a generation previously, and there brought up their children according to British ideas. Those ideas are now preached by the peasants who have returned to spend the evening of their lives in Croatia and Dalmatia, and to send out

the war-cry of ' Freedom for the Slavs ' to their more ignorant fellow-country people.

The autonomy of Croatia-Slavonia is simply a farce. The ' Ban ' (or Viceroy) has become merely the nominee of the Magyar Premier, and is to-day rather the representative of Budapest than of Zágréb. His powers are worthless in the event of any dispute between Croatia and Hungary. Very often he is a Magyar ! Polling is public, and the Magyar government can secure the return of its own candidates by terrorising electors on the way to the poll. Overtaxation, injustice, and tyranny characterise Hungarian rule over the Southern Slavs. Croatia asks for no doles from Austria-Hungary, nor any help, but merely for compensation for the evils done to her in the past, and for security and freedom for the future. The best patriots in Croatia have not hitherto set their faces against an understanding with Hungary. Their demand is ' that Croatia, Slavonia, Dalmatia, as a nation, ' should have the right to decide freely and independently ' concerning its existence and fate, and that it is justified in ' making every effort to uphold its national independence.' Starting on this foundation they have hitherto contended that the two peoples, Magyars and Slavs, can found an enduring friendship.

The late Balkan War showed how the pulse of the Slavs was beating. The Slavs of the Monarchy realised that their kindred across the Balkan frontier were fighting a splendid battle for freedom. The call of the blood was strong. ' Slavs ' —one and united ' became the watchword. The long smouldering enmity against Austria burst into flame. A wave of racial kinship went out towards Russia. Too late the statesmen of Austria and of Hungary have realised that Napoleon was a prophet as well as a soldier. He it was who first comprehended the Slavs of the South. His all too brief control of these ill-treated lands was the brightest and happiest they have known. The roads he built and the schools he opened made the Croats and Dalmatians his eternal debtors. He foresaw that if the Southern Slavs were to remain linked with Austria it was necessary to establish a Slavonic kingdom under the Hapsburg Crown. Whether that solution of the Southern Slav question is still possible, the conclusion of the present war will tell.

W. F. Bailey.

THE NATIONAL RECORDS

1. **Reports of the Royal Commission on Public Records, 1912 and 1914.** Cd. 6361, 6395, 6396; and Cd. 7544–7546.
2. **Report of the Committee on Local Records, 1902.** Cd. 1333 and 1335.
3. **Handbook to the Public Records.** By F. S. THOMAS. Stationery Office. 1853.
4. **A Guide to the Principal Classes of Documents preserved in the Public Record Office.** By S. R. SCARGILL-BIRD. Stationery Office. 1908.
5. **Reprint of Statutes, &c., governing the disposal of Public Records.** Stationery Office. 1914.
6. **The Annual Reports of the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records.** 1840–1914.

IT has been frequently remarked that American and Continental students are probably better acquainted with the contents of the Public Record Office than most Londoners. The same remark might perhaps be made of other national institutions in this country, but it is important to remember that the nation's records are something more than a collection of books or manuscripts, casually acquired, and preserved only for the purpose of instruction or entertainment.

In the first place these records, in the old sense of archives, are the most ancient of our national *insignia*, which include such kindred emblems as the flag and seal. We are assured by scholars who are best acquainted with the subject that archives have been preserved through all the centuries since the Norman Conquest, with the regalia and other precious contents of the royal treasury of the Kings of England. Such records are therefore of the greatest public interest as relics symbolical of the national life which has continued for so many centuries under successive dynasties.

Apart, however, from the claims of national sentiment, our public records possess a very practical utility. As national title-deeds they include the texts of the statutes of the realm,

charters of liberties, and foreign treaties. As records of a public nature they constitute, besides a register of titles, a vast and illuminating volume of case law and precedents for the guidance of jurists and statesmen. In plain terms, the public records can alone decide the justice of a nation's cause in the event of international claims or arbitration cases. In a score of other ways they can affect the welfare or the safety of the State. The part played by the secret despatch as a *casus belli* is a commonplace of historical romance. In an actual state of war, the despatches of commanding officers and the intelligence communicated by political agents are not only of consummate value to the belligerent States, but in later days they provide the main sources of information used by scientific historians in every country.

In times of peace the national archives have other uses which will be easily appreciated by any intelligent student of civil policy. The historian is still largely dependent on these sources for authentic information down to a comparatively modern date respecting the aims of political parties and the statutory or administrative measures which determine the foreign or colonial relations and affect the domestic welfare of the State. It is true that for a century past much of this information has been available as printed matter, but to the present day the efficiency and success of the adminstration of our naval, military, and civil services may still be measured by their departmental records. For each of these services their records are quite as indispensable as a banker's ledgers or a tradesman's day-books: and for the protection of an industrial community the record also has the force of a judicial decree. This indeed is the proper meaning of the word, and it opens up a long vista of legal processes which form an unequalled series of State records from the reign of Richard I. onwards.

The above may be mentioned as instances of the practical use of our public records. But experience warns us that recognition of their utility may alternate with periods of profound neglect. It is, therefore, to be hoped that the high ideal of national archives put forward by the Royal Commission now sitting will not be lost sight of, for the nation's duties and responsibilities in respect of its public records have never been greater than they are at the present moment.

In the extensive literature formed by the reports of more than a hundred Royal Commissions of one kind or another, the inquiries that have been held into the state of the public records of the United Kingdom occupy a distinctive position. At the beginning of the eighteenth century the 'State of 'the Public Records of the Kingdom' engaged the attention of Committees of the House of Lords for a period of more than twenty years. In 1732 the House of Commons made a useful report on the same subject, followed in 1772 by a still fuller inquiry. Early in the reign of George III., Commissioners were appointed to 'methodise' the records, and their futile efforts gave rise to a notable inquiry by a Committee of the House of Commons in 1799. This in turn led to the appointment of the Record Commissions which wasted much public money and still more precious opportunities between 1800 and 1836. In the latter year another Parliamentary Committee held an exhaustive and rather tedious inquiry into the charges of extravagance and inefficiency that were brought against the Record Commission from many sides. As the result of this inquiry the Commission was brought to an end, and its place was taken by the Public Record Office under an Act of Parliament in 1838. From that date to the year 1910 there was no general inquiry into the administration of the Public Record Office; but successive Masters of the Rolls and their Deputy Keepers presented annual reports to the Crown, which degenerated later into meagre summaries of official operations.

For more than seventy years, therefore, the Record Office had been taken on trust, and, judged by the only available standard of official capacity, this confidence was not misplaced. The department of the Master of the Rolls was, in fact, conducted on the same lines as the ordinary judicial and administrative departments of the State. The record officers were either assigned to it from the results of general competitive examinations or transferred thither from time to time by other departments. They received no special training, and were officially regarded as clerks and not as archivists. Indeed the later Victorian and Edwardian record officers seem to have actually lost the opportunities for professional initiative and advancement that fell in the way of some of their predecessors. The Assistant Keepers had become

mere ciphers; the Master of the Rolls was engrossed, after the passing of the Judicature Act, in his judicial functions, and the Deputy Keeper found himself the autocrat of our national archives. His name appeared on the title-page of nearly every record publication, and his official policy was dictated by his own tastes and inclinations. During this later period also the Record Office had developed new activities which were equally unguided by external counsels. The Historical Manuscripts Commission, appointed in 1869, had become practically a branch department of the Record Office. Agents had also been employed, from about the same date, to select and transcribe documents relating to English affairs in certain foreign archives. Again, in 1877, an Act of Parliament was procured by the Rolls authorities to regularise the disposal of superfluous records, and the statutory Committee by which the Act was administered was, naturally, composed of record officers nominated by the Deputy Keeper.

We have referred to the above aspects of the administration of the Public Record Office because several historical scholars have pointed out that the policy of that department has been characterised by a complete detachment from the scientific methods of record-keeping which are practised with conspicuous success in almost every other country. We gather further from the reports of the present Commission of Inquiry that this isolated policy is encouraged by the concentration of our national archives and by the fact that our archivistic undertakings have not been hitherto controlled or guided, as they are abroad, by administrative Commissions and Committees of Advice. These academic disputes probably had an important bearing on the appointment of the Royal Commission of Inquiry in October 1910.

The origin of that Commission is not a matter that concerns us here, but it is not difficult to see, in the light of recent events, that for some years past the administration of the Public Record Office had given rise to discontent in various quarters. The value of the records as essential sources of historical knowledge was duly appreciated, and a few earnest and independent scholars wished to see a fuller recognition of historical interests in connexion with the organisation of the official record publications. They desired also to secure an adequate historical training for record officers according to

the Continental method ; and, incidentally, they wanted more and better record publications and more ample facilities for students.

Possibly these historical scholars would have found means of their own for making their influence felt ; but an inquiry was forced by the intervention of other malcontents.

In 1830 the Welsh Courts of Justice were abolished, and in 1854 and 1855 the records were removed to the London Record Office, where they remained in an admittedly neglected state for more than fifty years. In 1908 we find that the claims of Welsh scholars of all parties to obtain the same attention for their national records as was bestowed on those of Scotland and Ireland were rejected by the authorities of the Record Office after a warm controversy. If we may judge from the evidence taken by the Commission and from correspondence in learned journals and the public press, some dissatisfaction existed also amongst English and American students owing to the rearrangement of certain classes of records in an arbitrary and unintelligent fashion. At the same time, documents of equal interest to other students were allowed to remain undescribed and therefore practically inaccessible. Finally we can gather from the same sources that some pardonable alarm was felt at the destruction of extensive series of records under a statutory authority.

Thus it came about that, a case for an inquiry having been admitted by the Government, a Royal Commission was appointed in October 1910. The restriction of the inquiry to the public records of England and Wales was evidently due to the fact that Scottish and Irish historians had taken no part in the recent agitation.

The procedure of a Royal Commission in the present day is well known to those who have any personal experience of public affairs, but it is not always taken into account by those who regard such reports as purely literary documents. The truth of the matter is that the report of a Commission of Inquiry into the administration of any public institution can never hope to be an ideal production,for though zeal and energy are usually displayed, an adequate knowledge of the subject of inquiry cannot always be ensured. Again, the terms of reference may be sufficiently wide, but interpreted in a timid or pedantic fashion. Finally, the method of investigation may

be purely conventional and perfunctory. Even when that method is intelligent and thorough, various circumstances may make it difficult to ascertain the real facts of the case ; and, in the end, opportunity will wait upon compromise.

It is also necessary to take into account the exceptional difficulties that may underlie an inquiry of this nature in the present day. During the previous inquiries, held in 1799 and 1836, the investigation of the administration of the public records was remarkably complete and effective, but in both cases the demand for reforms came from within the administrative circle. Guided in turn by the intimate knowledge of the true state of affairs possessed by their official advisers, and backed by wide and almost judicial powers, the Parliamentary Committees of 1799 and 1836 and the Royal Commissions of the intervening period were able to discover many defects in the system of record-keeping then in force. But even against such odds as these the officials in charge put up a stout defence, and the issues were frequently obscured by countercharges and recriminations.

Between these conditions and those which existed at the date of the appointment of the Royal Commission in 1910, an important difference must be noted. A new official record service had been created by the Act of 1838, and in course of time it had obtained all the powers and privileges of a government department with the further prestige of a learned institution. Even in the present day the Public Record Office Act is a sacrosanct ordinance, and the Master of the Rolls is still the *numen divinum*, though his fane has been removed and his voice is heard no more in learned exhortation.

It is not surprising, therefore, that the mere existence of a Public Record Office should have been regarded as a subject for national congratulation, and its administration as above criticism. Again, the Record Office, like other institutions, serves as a sort of club for many of its regular readers. Even to the initiated a record is still to some extent a privileged revelation which must be accepted thankfully and without question. It has been remarked that the devout reader usually resents criticism of the existing administration of learned institutions, partly from a feeling of scholarly fellowship with the officials, and partly from obvious motives of self-interest.

This sense of loyalty on the part of the public, coupled

with the *esprit de corps* of the department itself, must make the task of inquiry one of peculiar difficulty. In the first place, the evidence taken by the Commission will be conflicting. Then, as we have seen, the investigations of the Commissioners will be limited by the facilities and information which must be obtained from official sources. Moreover, as soon as it is known that an inquiry is on foot, every effort will be made to anticipate the recommendations of the Commission by internal reforms, the credit for which will eventually be regarded as due to the department itself. Therefore, unless the inquiry is conducted with knowledge, tact, and resolution, the actual result may be quite inconclusive, and the recommendations of the Commission will be of little permanent value.

It may perhaps be inferred from the First Report of the Record Commission of 1910 that some of the difficulties to which we have alluded were experienced in the course of its inquiry. The evidence of the official witnesses and the information supplied to the Commission from official sources tell us very little about the actual condition of the records, and if the recommendations of the Commission had been based on these conclusions they would have been commonplace indeed. Perhaps the official version of the matter was a very natural one, and it was unquestionably given in good faith. The Commissioners were assured that all that was possible had been done to account for and to safeguard the records not yet transferred to the custody of the Master of the Rolls. They were also assured that, with a few unimportant exceptions, the records already transferred had been arranged and catalogued, and that, before the end of the year 1912, lists of all the departmental records would have been printed.

The Commissioners, however, took some independent evidence, and they seem to have made inquiries on their own account. As a result of these investigations they were moved to make some recommendations of a rather drastic nature with regard to the administration of the Public Record Office.

Probably the most casual inspection would have revealed imperfections in a system which had few features in common with the scientific administration of the Continental repositories, and it should be remembered that our Commissioners had made profitable visits to the archives of France, Belgium,

and Holland. It is perfectly obvious, from the general tone of their Report, that the inevitable comparison between the English and foreign methods was unfavourable to the former. This view of the matter especially affects the various devices for the custody and production of records, their arrangement and classification, and the compilation of summary lists printed for convenience of reference.

The reports of the Commissioners in 1912 and 1914 reveal a singular want of method as to the preservation of numerous State documents which, though not deposited in the Public Record Office, are under the statutory charge and superintendence of the Master of the Rolls by virtue of the Public Record Office Act of 1838. If this reading of the statute is correct, such documents should have been periodically inspected and properly cared for by the officers of the Master of the Rolls, in whatever custody they might actually be placed. Unfortunately this statutory duty was not carried out, and very serious losses to historical research have resulted from this neglect.

Record officers who have told the story of the national archives have mentioned a tradition that at the date of the Act of 1838 the Public Records were preserved in no fewer than sixty repositories, for the most part mere sepulchres of documentary history. We can now see clearly, from the Reports of the present Commission, that these were repositories of judicial records only, and in many cases they merely represented the overflows of the main 'treasuries' of the Courts of Common Law and Exchequer. The Chancery Records formed another group scattered up and down the 'Lane,' with dépôts in the Tower of London and the Rolls Chapel. At the southern extremity of this narrow belt of sordid record offices, extending from the Tower to Whitehall, and from Gray's Inn and Carlton Ride to Somerset House and Westminster Hall, lay the new State Paper Office in St. James's Park. The papers of the Secretaries of State were, however, excluded for the time being from the operation of the Act, as were also the valuable records of the property of the Crown. No express mention was made of the records of the public departments or of the Royal Household, nor was any definite provision made for many heterogeneous records of a judicial nature.

It is, however, only fair to the authorities of the Record

Office to mention that they had welcomed the transfer of many departmental records since the year 1840, in order to suit the convenience of the Departments; but neither the Record Office nor the Departments whence the records had been received knew with any certainty whether the tale was complete. Even after a custody of more than fifty years, large masses of records remained unsorted, and in some cases rotting in sacks and chests and such-like primitive receptacles. Again, many tons of records, relating chiefly to naval and military affairs, which had hitherto survived countless perils of fire and flood, of shameful pillage and wilful neglect, were found to have been officially destroyed.

The First Report of the Commission deals at considerable length with the delicate and difficult task of disposing of superfluous records under the powers contained in the Public Record Office Acts of 1877 and 1898. There are many antiquaries who object, on principle, to any destruction of records whatsoever, and such destruction appears to be contrary to the general practice of foreign archives. Even when it is practised with the utmost caution, and with ample knowledge and full consideration of all the circumstances, it may easily have disastrous consequences. One argument that is advanced to justify the destruction of public records lays stress on the greater facilities afforded for consulting documents of real value if worthless documents are destroyed. It may be suggested that a desire to economise space is a more pressing motive; while it is obviously easier to deal with large and unarranged masses of records if authorised destruction goes hand in hand with sortation. Be this as it may, the Commissioners have severely criticised the procedure of the Committee appointed in 1882 by the Master of the Rolls to carry out the Act of 1877; but they report that of late years the administration of that Act has been vastly improved.

Perhaps the most disquieting of the revelations printed in this Report concerns the ultimate disposal of records condemned for destruction. From time to time the passer-by may still see in the courtyard of some government department a van which displays the following plausible advertisement:

THOUSANDS OF POUNDS WASTED DAILY!
SAVE YOUR WASTE PAPERS!

From a business point of view this advice has perhaps been justified, for 'golden' waste, in the shape of Admiralty and War Office records, seems to have been realised, within the present century, by government contractors or their discerning customers. Few graver official scandals than the sale of 'valueless' naval and military records to American booksellers, under the nose of the Stationery Office, have been exposed by any public inquiry in recent times.

It has been frequently stated that greater facilities are given to students who consult Continental archives than are accorded by our own Government. This statement may have been justified in earlier days, but a beneficent change was effected by the Report of a Departmental Committee in 1908. The Commissioners admit that the management of the Government search room in the Public Record Office, where departmental records are produced, is now very satisfactory. They also make a proper acknowledgement of the public services of the present Deputy Keeper, whose urbanity and scholarly attainments command the regard and respect of all who come in contact with his department.

We have no reason to suppose that the Commissioners are prejudiced in favour of Continental methods of record-keeping, but undoubtedly they are anxious to suggest improvements for the purpose of bringing the administration of the Public Record Office into line with the highly efficient organisation of the State archives abroad. With this intention they are unanimously of opinion that a change in the government of the Public Record Office is essential. The titular headship of the Master of the Rolls must be replaced by the control of a permanent Commission, with a Board of Advice for record publications. At the same time the Deputy Keeper must cease to be a practically irresponsible administrator, and must take the title and position of Director and Secretary. The proposed constitution, while it resembles that of certain foreign archives, has already been found to work well in the case of the British Museum and some other learned institutions in this country.

The Second Report of the present Record Commission is concerned with the official documents still in the immediate custody of the courts of justice and public departments. Of these some are papers still in use which will be transferred,

as they mature, to the great repository in Fetter Lane where the earlier volumes of the series are already deposited. The Commissioners were not altogether convinced by official assurances as to the condition of these 'outlying records,' and took measures to ascertain the extent and nature of the official documents still preserved in departmental repositories. For this purpose they circulated various forms of inquiry, and made numerous personal inspections and investigations. The authorities of the Public Record Office do not seem to have known of the existence of a tithe of this vast mass of outlying records; while as for the courts and departments, some were unwilling, and others were unable, to give the information required. Few of the departmental officials appear to have regarded the safe custody of their documents as a matter of any consequence, or to have been conscious of the important distinction between the making and the keeping of records. Indeed, the lack of knowledge or interest displayed by some of the witnesses who represented their departments before the Commission is very noticeable. 'We have observed with 'regret,' write the Commissioners, 'that of all the custodians 'of records to whom we have applied for information, the least 'competent to satisfy our inquiries have been found among 'Your Majesty's immediate servants.' In justice to these officials, it should be added that as soon as they realised the requirements of the Commission they rose to the occasion.

It must not be supposed, however, that all the 'outlying 'records' are of permanent historical value. Most of the judicial records are of purely legal and litigious interest, although the great registries in Somerset House and elsewhere have at length received the close attention that they deserve. Again, the records of the secretarial and civil departments are in many cases merely accruing records. It is otherwise with the naval and military records and some more relating to direct and indirect taxation. These have for the most part been newly discovered by the Commission, and but for its exertions they would not perhaps have seen the light in this generation.

We gather that it was officially understood that all War Office Records previous to the year 1870 had been transferred to the Record Office, and yet the Commission has discovered many thousands of records still outstanding, ranging in date from the reign of Charles II. to that of Queen Victoria. We also

read in an Appendix to this Report (p. 178) that no military despatches of later date than the battle of Waterloo were to be found amongst the War Office documents at the Record Office. The War Office explains that previous to 1855 these despatches were mixed up with the records of other Secretaries of State. From 1842 onwards a more or less complete series was discovered in the War Office. Elsewhere we come across other important series which had not been transferred to the Record Office. Besides the above, which had been apparently overlooked, an immense quantity of early departmental, regimental, and garrison records were located and inspected by the Commission. These records were not destined for transmission to the Record Office; their existence was probably unknown to any but a few storekeepers or staff clerks, and their position was evidently one of some peril. For example, the Commissioners found at Portsmouth many Ordnance records going back to the seventeenth century, but at Plymouth the companion series of records had been 'quite recently . . . destroyed by a Board of Officers acting 'under the King's Regulations.'

The transfer of the Admiralty records to the Record Office began as early as 1840, and from a list of these published in 1904 students would have expected to find all the historical naval documents down to 1860 in the charge of the Master of the Rolls. The investigations of the Commission show that very valuable records, dating from the Restoration, had been retained in the Admiralty or its departments, while many thousands more lay unheeded and uncared for in the dockyards.

A similar state of things prevailed in respect of the records of other departments, but considerations of space prevent further comment on these serious revelations. We have referred to the position of the War Office and Admiralty records because their use as well as their destiny are matters of national concern at the present moment. It should be remembered that in time of war many special types of judicial and administrative records are created over and above the normal forms. The proceedings of the Prize Courts are not only of great moment to the parties concerned, but create invaluable precedents which can be used in building up a general code of International Law. The activities of Courts Martial are

also greatly increased, and, for the rest, much importance must be attached to the details of transport and supply, communications, and other matters on which the solution of certain professional problems may largely depend. We are reminded by the Report that naval and military affairs, like other aspects of the national history, must be based on complete and permanent records which can be cited for the verification of all important statements. Such is the method of writers like Sir John Laughton and Mr. Julian Corbett, of Mr. Fortescue and Professor Oman. Future historians who follow in their footsteps will be seriously hindered if material records are mislaid or rashly destroyed.

The dissatisfaction expressed by the Public Records Commission in its First Report with regard to the disposal of valueless records is chiefly directed against the extensive depletion of the naval and military records some fifteen or twenty years ago. In their Second Report the Commissioners examine more closely the system of 'weeding' departmental records under the authority of the Acts of 1877 and 1898, and they criticise the system of 'continuing schedules,' whereby a free hand has been given to civil servants to rid themselves of inconvenient accumulations of their older records. The Commissioners point out that, even when the statutory procedure is strictly observed, the 'schedules' may be prepared by officials who have received no general historical training, and who might not therefore be competent to determine the value of particular records.

This Report does not attempt to estimate the possible losses that have been sustained through the reckless or unintelligent destruction of official documents, but the instances given in the Appendices are sufficiently impressive. To some extent, indeed, the need for further precaution is admitted by the departments concerned. There is every reason to believe that the Act of 1877 has done good service in staying the ruthless destruction of official documents, but it would be rash to say that all peril is past. In the case of the naval and military records still retained by various units, there is an authority which apparently overrides the Act of Parliament, namely the King's Regulations, which authorise the destruction of old service records after examination by a board of officers. Though we are ready to believe that British officers are, as a

rule, quite aware of the value and interest of the service records, from time to time it may happen that an iconoclast takes command and makes a clean sweep of ancient idols.

In the early part of the last century it had become necessary to take strong measures to safeguard the records of regiments proceeding on foreign service. The Editor of the 'Graphic' has called the attention of the Commission to a stern official rebuke addressed to the officer commanding a regiment which had offended in this way:

'10th April, 1824.

'Sir,—The Commander-in-Chief having learnt, by a communication from the Secretary at War, that almost the whole of the Regimental Records of the 24th Regiment have been destroyed, I am commanded by H.R.H. to call upon you to state, distinctly, by whose authority so unmilitary and unwarrantable a proceeding has taken place, in order that the Commander-in-Chief may visit the author of it with some mark of his serious displeasure.

I have, &c.,
HENRY TORRENS,
Adjutant General.

'Major Craig,
or Officer Commanding 24th Regiment,
Gosport.'

Again, the records of our public offices are frequently sacrificed for want of space. There is a persistent tradition in official circles that whenever a department removes to a new office a bonfire is lighted in the backyard of its former premises. That such a legend is not wholly fanciful is shown by the fate of many of the military records of the Judge Advocate General. We also learn from the Reports of this Commission that in the confusion that prevailed during the Crimean War, large masses of records were suddenly shifted from their repositories and received inadequate accommodation elsewhere.

Enough instances have been given to show that the Commissioners were justified in their opinion that 'the custody, 'repair, arrangement and description of the records . . . . 'still leave much to be desired'; that 'for want of a proper 'method of transfer' numerous historical documents have been hoarded in official cupboards, whilst at the same time the Public Record Office has been congested by the indiscriminate transmission of documents of no permanent or legitimate value, and that 'many documents, which would now be considered

'valuable, have been destroyed in spite of the Public Record 'Office Acts.'

The researches of the Commissioners for the purpose of elucidating the history and relationships of the national archives, their active labours in locating and inspecting stray collections, and the conclusions to which they have come in respect of the custody, disposal, and description of the records, will doubtless pave the way for many administrative reforms. We learn from the Second Report of the Commission that certain recommendations made in its First Report have been already carried out by the Record Office itself, the Treasury, the Office of Works and the Stationery Office. It is, of course, possible that this process of departmental reformation may be continued, but although the worst defects of the existing system of record-keeping may thus be remedied, the causes of those defects will still remain.

We seem, however, to require some further exposition of the true meaning and effect of the Public Record Office Act of 1838 and the Order in Council of 1852. In particular the supposed option enjoyed by the departments with regard to acknowledging the jurisdiction of the Master of the Rolls must be better justified. It is also essential that the statutory protection of the public records should be more clearly defined. For, contrary to the general belief, the Act of 1877 does not explicitly forbid the destruction of official documents: it merely affords facilities for their disposal under proper regulations.

It might even be possible to supplement the Reports of this Commission by devising some means of checking another and a growing source of national loss, the appropriation and sale of public records. Here the difficulty is that public records, in their embryonic stage as official documents, are at the disposal of Ministers of State and, through inadvertence, may easily remain in private custody. In such cases it seems that there is nothing to prevent their immediate custodians from offering them for sale, and it is common knowledge that large collections of important state papers, now missing from their places in the official series, have recently been sold, chiefly to foreign purchasers, for fabulous sums. At the same time this question is a very difficult one. A process of resumption has not the same excuse as that which obtains abroad, and an attack on 'private property' might lead, as Mr.

Fortescue suggests, to the concealment or possibly to the destruction of valuable papers. Moreover, such a policy would seriously impede the operations of the Historical Manuscripts Commission, and it would paralyse the purchasing powers of the British Museum and other native libraries. Here again there seems to be scope for the deliberations of a departmental committee, for public opinion certainly needs to be further educated in this matter.

The large and difficult problem connected with the housing and equipment of the archives must be solved by other means than mere administrative capacity. The Public Records Commission has done good service by ascertaining the probable bulk of the records which require proper treatment, and the probable size of the establishments required for their custody. The extent of the records is prodigious. 'We believe,' the Commissioners observe, 'that neither the authorities of the 'Record Office nor Your Majesty's Government realise that 'these outstanding records exceed in bulk those which have 'been already transferred to the Record Office.' The Commission has propounded several alternative plans for their disposal, but the recommendations are slightly confused and somewhat ineffective. Their general effect appears to be in favour of an immediate extension of the Public Record Office. Probably such an extension may be eventually necessary, but the Commissioners do not seem to have made any independent inquiries as to the causes or extent of the alleged congestion of the existing building. The question of accommodation for records is certainly one of importance, and possibly of urgency, but it may be very differently regarded by officials and by public economists. It is only to be expected that a Government department should take every opportunity to secure extensions of its sphere of usefulness. A new wing, opened with appropriate ceremony, must add to the dignity and importance of the establishment; but before a very large sum of public money is spent on such an undertaking it might be as well to know how it can be spent most usefully.

After all, the Fetter Lane repository is an old building, as public offices are now counted, and it compares most unfavourably, according to the Report of the Commission, with the relatively inexpensive repositories of archives in Belgium and Holland. In view of the immense sums that have been

spent upon our national archives during recent years, and the inadequate return that has been received from this branch of the public service, on the showing of the Commission itself, the question of further accommodation for the records ought certainly to be referred to a departmental Committee. The great point seems to be that the present casual, wasteful, and unsuitable accommodation should be overhauled, and that any new buildings should be specially designed from the best models available and under expert advice. The new Record Offices need not be designed after a *modèle de luxe*, like the Vienna archives. In the French, Dutch, and Belgian archives the repository itself constitutes the main building, and we gather from the very interesting itineraries of the Commissioners that in these countries the offices of the administration are usually of extremely modest proportions, for here the archivist works amongst his archives.

There remains the further problem of the record establishments. The Commission has dealt very fully with the vexed question of the appointment and training of record officers in its two reports. Amongst other interesting information a table showing the estimated cost of the departmental establishments is printed in an Appendix to the Second Report. The figures given here are amazing, even if we make a liberal allowance for the difficulty experienced by the Departments in distinguishing between clerical and record work. We read that the 'admitted cost of the record establishments outside the 'Public Record Office' amounts to a sum of close on £120,000, with a total staff employed of 901 persons of all ranks. In comparison with these figures, we note that the Public Record Office, which undertakes the main record work of the State, costs £22,000 and employs 108 persons.

It is admitted, both by the Commission and its official correspondents, that the above statistics are to some extent misleading, and the estimated establishments probably exceed the actual number employed in certain cases. On the other hand, there are numerous omissions and some obvious discrepancies in the official statements rendered to the Commission. We cannot believe, for instance, that the record work of the War Office costs only £868 and employs only three officers. Surely this return is stultified by the information printed elsewhere as to the work in the War Office Registry, which still retains papers

going back to 1792. Moreover, this return ignores the ' officers ' in charge of records ' in every military district or depot whose duties in safeguarding official documents are meticulously set forth in a War Office paper printed in this Report. In some cases it would be interesting to know more about these establishments, including some that have been inspected by the Commission with instructive results. But even in the case of the Admiralty, which, we learn, was responsible for the ' most ' careful, intelligent, and adequate return furnished to the ' Commission,' there appear to have been no responsible record keepers in certain stations. The result, we may add, is that the records of the old naval yard at Gibraltar have perished, while a vast accumulation of loyalist records at Halifax has mysteriously disappeared.

If, however, we balance the omissions or suppressions against the overstatements, we probably shall not be far from the real facts with regard to the establishments. On this assumption the figures clearly imply an inordinate expenditure upon ' outlying ' records, the very existence of most of which will now be heard of for the first time. It is also apparent that the professional value of these record services is inferior to that supplied, at far less cost, by the Deputy Keeper of the Public Records and his staff. Here and there, it is true, we find an expert archivist available, and some attempt made to classify and describe the older records and to make them accessible to students. Such cases, however, are exceptional, and if it be true that nearly a thousand civil servants are employed upon a mere travesty of scientific record-keeping, we can only suppose that they are persons for whom no other occupation could be found.

Here, then, was the opportunity of the Record Commissioners to support their scheme for the reform of the departmental record system by an *argumentum ad hominem*, and they make the most of the opportunity. Probably there is much force in their recommendations for reorganising the existing archive service altogether. In any case it is useless to attempt to patch the administration of the departmental archives. Adequate accommodation should be provided in the least expensive form, and a small body of trained record officers should take the places of a larger number of inexpert clerks. Finally, the central and departmental

archives should be closely linked, and the record service should include a division for Local Records of a public nature, as proposed by the Commission. As to ways and means, it might be preferable to save a large immediate outlay on crude expansions of the Public Record Office and to spend the money in fitting and equipping the departmental archives. The Government would naturally be expected to contribute towards the cost of county and borough repositories of local records, provided these are able to house the 'outlying' official records of the dockyards, arsenals, and outports; but the whole cost would probably be less than that of additional buildings in the neighbourhood of Chancery Lane.

As for the record establishments, we have seen that there are good grounds for the belief that a very considerable saving might be effected on the present salary list as estimated above. With the creation of an official class of record officers, trained according to the French and Belgian methods, the unsatisfactory conditions under which our national records are now preserved might be completely changed.

VOLTAIRE AND ENGLAND

1. **Correspondance de Voltaire (1726–1729).** By LUCIEN FOULET. Paris: Hachette. 1913.
2. **Lettres Philosophiques de Voltaire.** Edition Critique. By GUSTAVE LANSON. Paris: Édouard Cornély. 1909.
3. **Voltaire, Montesquieu, and Rousseau in England.** By CHURTON COLLINS. Eveleigh Nash. 1908.
4. **La Jeunesse de Voltaire.** By GUSTAVE DESNOIRESTERRES. Paris. 1867.

THE visit of Voltaire to England marks a turning-point in the history of civilisation. It was the first step in that long process of interaction between the French and English cultures whose results have been so momentous in the development of Europe, and are sufficiently visible at the present hour. Before Voltaire the forces of mutual ignorance and political hostility had combined for centuries to keep the two nations apart. It was he who planted the small seed of friendship which, in spite of a thousand hostile influences, in spite of the long wars of the eighteenth century, in spite of Napoleon, in spite of all the powers of hereditary enmity and instinctive distrust, was to grow and flourish so mightily. Doubtless the seed fell on good ground; doubtless if Voltaire had never left his native country some chance wind would have carried it over the narrow seas, and, in the main, history would have been unaltered. Yet it is worth remembering that actually his was the hand which did the work. That close and singular relationship between the French and the English, which, underlying and transcending the combinations of politics, has found its consummation at Mons and at Cambrai, on the Oise and on the Marne, began to exist when a remarkably thin young man, with darting eyes and a smile of ambiguous significance, stepped briskly on shore at Dover nearly two hundred years ago.

It is unfortunate that our knowledge of so important a period in Voltaire's life should be extremely incomplete.

Carlyle, who gave a hasty glance at it in his life of Frederick, declared that he could find nothing but 'mere inanity and 'darkness visible'; and since Carlyle's day the progress has been small. A short chapter in Desnoiresterres' long Biography and an essay by Churton Collins did something to co-ordinate the few known facts. Another step was taken a few years ago with the publication of M. Lanson's elaborate and exhaustive edition of the 'Lettres Philosophiques,' the work in which Voltaire gave to the world the distilled essence of his English experiences. And now M. Lucien Foulet has brought together all the extant letters concerning the period, which he has collated with scrupulous exactitude and to which he has added a series of valuable appendices upon various obscure and disputed points. M. Lanson's great attainments are well known, and to say that M. Foulet's work may fitly rank as a supplementary volume to the edition of the 'Lettres 'Philosophiques' is simply to say that he is a worthy follower of that noble tradition of profound research and perfect lucidity which has made French scholarship one of the unique glories of European culture.

Upon the events in particular which led up to Voltaire's departure for England M. Foulet has been able to throw considerable light. The story, as revealed by the letters of contemporary observers and the official documents of the police, is an instructive and curious one. In the early days of January 1726 Voltaire, who was thirty-one years of age, occupied a position which, so far as could be seen upon the surface, could hardly have been more fortunate. He was recognised everywhere as the rising poet of the day; he was a successful dramatist; he was a friend of Madame de Prie, who was all-powerful at Court, and his talents had been rewarded by a pension from the royal purse. His brilliance, his gaiety, his extraordinary capacity for being agreeable had made him the pet of the narrow and aristocratic circle which dominated France. Dropping his middle-class antecedents as completely as he had dropped his middle-class name, young Arouet, the notary's offspring, floated at his ease through the palaces of dukes and princes, with whose sons he drank and jested, and for whose wives—it was *de rigueur* in those days—he expressed all the ardours of a passionate and polite devotion. Such was his roseate situation when,

all at once, the catastrophe came. One night at the Opéra the Chevalier de Rohan-Chabot, of the famous and powerful family of the Rohans, a man of forty-three, quarrelsome, blustering, whose reputation for courage left something to be desired, began to taunt the poet upon his birth—'Monsieur 'Arouet, Monsieur Voltaire—what *is* your name?' To which the retort came quickly—'Whatever my name may be, 'I know how to preserve the honour of it.' The Chevalier muttered something and went off, but the incident was not ended. Voltaire had let his high spirits and his sharp tongue carry him too far, and he was to pay the penalty. It was not an age in which it was safe to be too witty with lords. 'Now 'mind, Dancourt,' said one of those *grands seigneurs* to the leading actor of the day, 'if you're more amusing than I am 'at dinner to-night, *je te donnerai cent coups de bâtons.*' It was dangerous enough to show one's wits at all in the company of such privileged persons, but to do so at their expense——! A few days later Voltaire and the Chevalier met again, at the Comédie, in Adrienne Lecouvreur's dressing-room. Rohan repeated his sneering question and 'the Chevalier has had 'his answer' was Voltaire's reply. Furious, Rohan lifted his stick, but at that moment Adrienne very properly fainted, and the company dispersed. A few days more and Rohan had perfected the arrangements for his revenge. Voltaire, dining at the Duc de Sully's, where, we are told, he was on the footing of a son of the house, received a message that he was wanted outside in the street. He went out, was seized by a gang of lackeys and beaten before the eyes of Rohan, who directed operations from a cab. 'Epargnez la tête,' he shouted, 'elle est encore bonne pour faire rire le public'; upon which, according to one account, there were exclamations from the crowd which had gathered round of 'Ah! le bon 'seigneur!' The sequel is known to everyone: how Voltaire rushed back, dishevelled and agonised, into Sully's dining-room, how he poured out his story in an agitated flood of words, and how that high-born company, with whom he had been living up to that moment on terms of the closest intimacy, now only displayed the signs of a frigid indifference. The caste-feeling had suddenly asserted itself. Poets, no doubt, were all very well in their way, but really, if they began squabbling with noblemen, what could they expect? And

then the callous and stupid convention of that still half-barbarous age—the convention which made misfortune the proper object of ridicule—came into play no less powerfully. One might take a poet seriously, perhaps—until he was whipped; then, of course, one could only laugh at him. For the next few days, wherever Voltaire went he was received with icy looks, covert smiles, or exaggerated politeness. The Prince de Conti, who, a month or two before, had written an ode in which he placed the author of 'Œdipe' side by side with the authors of 'Le Cid' and 'Phèdre,' now remarked, with a shrug of the shoulders, that 'ces coups de bâtons étaient bien 'reçus et mal donnés.' 'Nous serions bien malheureux,' said another well-bred personage, as he took a pinch of snuff, 'si les poètes n'avaient pas des épaules.' Such friends as remained faithful were helpless. Even Madame de Prie could do nothing. 'Le pauvre Voltaire me fait grande pitié,' she said; 'dans le fond il a raison.' But the influence of the Rohan family was too much for her, and she could only advise him to disappear for a little into the country, lest worse should befall. Disappear he did, remaining for the next two months concealed in the outskirts of Paris, where he practised swordsmanship against his next meeting with his enemy. The situation was cynically topsy-turvy. As M. Foulet points out, Rohan had legally rendered himself liable, under the edict against duelling, to a long term of imprisonment, if not to the penalty of death. Yet the law did not move, and Voltaire was left to take the only course open in those days to a man of honour in such circumstances—to avenge the insult by a challenge and a fight. But now the law, which had winked at Rohan, began to act against Voltaire. The police were instructed to arrest him so soon as he should show any sign of an intention to break the peace. One day he suddenly appeared at Versailles, evidently on the look-out for Rohan, and then as suddenly vanished. A few weeks later, the police reported that he was in Paris, lodging with a fencing-master, and making no concealment of his desire to 'insulter incessamment et avec éclat M. le chevalier de Rohan.' This decided the authorities, and accordingly on the night of the 17th of April, as we learn from the 'Police Gazette,' 'le sieur Arrouët de Voltaire, fameux poète,' was arrested, and conducted 'par ordre du Roi' to the Bastille.

A letter, written by Voltaire to his friend Madame de Bernières while he was still in hiding, reveals the effect which these events had produced upon his mind. It is the first letter in the series of his collected correspondence which is not all Epicurean elegance and caressing wit. The wit, the elegance, the finely turned phrase, the shifting smile—these things are still visible there, no doubt, but they are informed and overmastered by a new, an almost ominous, spirit: Voltaire, for the first time in his life, is serious.

'J'ai été à l'extrémité; je n'attends que ma convalescence pour abandonner à jamais ce pays-ci. Souvenez-vous de l'amitié tendre que vous avez eue pour moi; au nom de cette amitié informez-moi par un mot de votre main de ce qui se passe, ou parlez à l'homme que je vous envoi, en qui vous pouvez prendre une entière confiance. Présentez mes respects à Madame du Deffand; dites à Thieriot que je veux absolument qu'il m'aime, ou quand je serai mort, ou quand je serai heureux; jusque-là, je lui pardonne son indifférence. Dites à M. le chevalier des Alleurs que je n'oublierai jamais la générosité de ses procédés pour moi. Comptez que tout détrompé que je suis de la vanité des amitiés humaines, la vôtre me sera à jamais précieuse. Je ne souhaite de revenir à Paris que pour vous voir, vous embrasser encore une fois, et vous faire voir ma constance dans mon amitié et dans mes malheurs.'

'Présentez mes respects à Madame du Deffand!' Strange indeed are the whirligigs of Time! Madame de Bernières was then living in none other than that famous house at the corner of the Rue de Beaune and the Quai des Théatins (now Quai Voltaire) where, more than half a century later, the writer of those lines was to come, bowed down under the weight of an enormous celebrity, to look for the last time upon Paris and the world; where, too, Madame du Deffand herself, decrepit, blind, and bitter with the disillusionments of a strange lifetime, was to listen once more to the mellifluous enchantments of that extraordinary intelligence, which—so it seemed to her as she sat entranced—could never, never grow old.*

Voltaire was not kept long in the Bastille. For some time

* 'Il est aussi animé qu'il ait jamais été. Il a quatre-vingt-quatre ans, et en vérité je le crois immortel; il jouit de tous ses sens, aucun même n'est affaibli; c'est un être bien singulier, et en vérité fort supérieur.' Madame du Deffand to Horace Walpole, 12 Avril 1778.

he had entertained a vague intention of visiting England, and he now begged for permission to leave the country. The authorities, whose one object was to prevent an unpleasant *fracas*, were ready enough to substitute exile for imprisonment; and thus, after a fortnight's detention, the 'fameux poète' was released on condition that he should depart forthwith, and remain, until further permission, at a distance of at least fifty leagues from Versailles.

It is from this point onwards that our information grows scanty and confused. We know that Voltaire was in Calais early in May, and it is generally agreed that he crossed over to England shortly afterwards. His subsequent movements are uncertain. We find him established at Wandsworth in the middle of October, but it is probable that in the interval he had made a secret journey to Paris with the object—in which he did not succeed—of challenging the Chevalier de Rohan to a duel. Where he lived during these months is unknown, but apparently it was not in London. The date of his final departure from England is equally in doubt; M. Foulet adduces some reasons for supposing that he returned secretly to France in November 1728, and in that case the total length of the English visit was just two and a half years. Churton Collins, however, prolongs it until March 1729. A similar obscurity hangs over all the details of Voltaire's stay. Not only are his own extant letters during this period unusually few, but allusions to him in contemporary English correspondences are almost entirely absent. We have to depend upon scattered hints, uncertain inferences, and conflicting rumours. We know that he stayed for some time at Wandsworth with a certain Everard Falkener in circumstances which he described to Thieriot in a letter in English—an English quaintly flavoured with the gay impetuosity of another race. 'At my coming to London,' he wrote, 'I found my 'damned Jew was broken.' (He had depended upon some bills of exchange drawn upon a Jewish broker.)

'I was without a penny, sick to dye of a violent aguë, stranger, alone, helpless, in the midst of a city wherein I was known to no body; my Lord and Lady Bolingbroke were into the country; I could not make bold to see our Ambassadour in so wretched a condition. I had never undergone such distress; but I am born to run through all the misfortunes of life. In these circumstances

my star, that among all its direful influences pours allways on me some kind refreshment, sent to me an English gentleman unknown to me, who forced me to receive some money that I wanted. An other London citisen that I had seen but once at Paris, carried me to his own country house, wherein I lead an obscure and charming life since that time, without going to London, and quite given over to the pleasures of indolence and friendshipp. The true and generous affection of this man who soothes the bitterness of my life brings me to love you more and more. All the instances of friendshipp indear my friend Tiriot to me. I have seen often mylord and mylady Bolinbroke ; I have found their affection still the same, even increased in proportion to my unhappiness ; they offered me all, their money, their house ; but I have refused all, because they are lords, and I have accepted all from Mr. Faulknear, because he is a single gentleman.'

We know that the friendship thus begun continued for many years, but as to who or what Everard Falkener was—besides the fact that he was a 'single gentleman'—we have only just information enough to make us wish for more.

'I am here,' he wrote after Voltaire had gone, 'just as you 'left me, neither merrier nor sadder, nor richer nor poorer, 'enjoying perfect health, having everything that makes life 'agreeable, without love, without avarice, without ambition, 'and without envy ; and as long as all this lasts I shall take 'the liberty to call myself a very happy man.' This stoical Englishman was a merchant who eventually so far overcame his distaste both for ambition and for love, as to become first Ambassador at Constantinople and then Postmaster-General—has anyone, before or since, ever held such a singular succession of offices ?—and to wind up by marrying, as we are intriguingly told, at the age of sixty-three, 'the illegitimate daughter of 'General Churchill.'

We have another glimpse of Voltaire at Wandsworth in a curious document brought to light by M. Lanson. Edward Higginson, an assistant master at a Quaker's school there, remembered how the excitable Frenchman used to argue with him for hours in Latin on the subject of 'water-baptism,' until at last Higginson produced a text from St. Paul which seemed conclusive.

'Some time after, Voltaire being at the Earl Temple's seat in Fulham, with Pope and others such, in their conversation fell on the subject of water-baptism. Voltaire assumed the part of a quaker, and at length came to mention that assertion of Paul.

They questioned there being any such assertion in all his writings; on which was a large wager laid, as near as I remember of £500: and Voltaire, not retaining where it was, had one of the Earl's horses, and came over the ferry from Fulham to Putney. . . . When I came he desired me to give him in writing the place where Paul said, *he was not sent to baptize*; which I presently did. Then courteously taking his leave, he mounted and rode back'—

and, we must suppose, won his wager.

'He seemed so taken with me [adds Higginson] as to offer to buy out the remainder of my time. I told him I expected my master would be very exorbitant in his demand. He said, let his demand be what it might, he would give it on condition I would yield to be his companion, keeping the same company, and I should always, in every respect, fare as he fared, wearing my clothes like his and of equal value: telling me then plainly, he was a Deist; adding, so were most of the noblemen in France and in England; deriding the account given by the four Evangelists concerning the birth of Christ, and his miracles, etc. so far that I desired him to desist: for I could not bear to hear my Saviour so reviled and spoken against. Whereupon he seemed under a disappointment, and left me with some reluctance.'

In London itself we catch fleeting visions of the eager gesticulating figure, hurrying out from his lodgings in Billiter Square—'Belitery Square' he calls it—or at the sign of the 'White Whigg' in Maiden Lane, Covent Garden, to go off to the funeral of Sir Isaac Newton in Westminster Abbey, or to pay a call on Congreve, or to attend a Quakers' Meeting. One would like to know in which street it was that he found himself surrounded by an insulting crowd, whose jeers at the 'French dog' he turned to enthusiasm by jumping upon a milestone, and delivering a harangue beginning—'Brave 'Englishmen! Am I not sufficiently unhappy in not having 'been born among you?' Then there are one or two stories of him in the great country houses—at Bubb Dodington's, where he met Dr. Young and disputed with him upon the episode of Sin and Death in 'Paradise Lost' with such vigour that at last Young burst out with the couplet:

> 'You are so witty, profligate, and thin,
> At once we think you Milton, Death, and Sin':

and at Blenheim, where the old Duchess of Marlborough hoped to lure him into helping her with her decocted memoirs, until she found that he had scruples, when in a fury she snatched

the papers out of his hands. 'I thought,' she cried, 'the man 'had sense; but I find him at bottom either a fool or a 'philosopher.'

It is peculiarly tantalising that our knowledge should be almost at its scantiest in the very direction in which we should like to know most, and in which there was most reason to hope that our curiosity might have been gratified. Of Voltaire's relations with the circle of Pope, Swift, and Bolingbroke only the most meagre details have reached us. His correspondence with Bolingbroke, whom he had known in France and whose presence in London was one of his principal inducements in coming to England—a correspondence which must have been considerable—has completely disappeared. Nor, in the numerous published letters which passed about between the members of that distinguished group, is there any reference to Voltaire's name. Now and then some chance remark raises our expectations, only to make our disappointment more acute. Many years later, for instance, in 1765, a certain Major Broome paid a visit to Ferney, and made the following entry in his diary:

'Dined with Mons. Voltaire, who behaved very politely. He is very old, was dressed in a robe-de-chambre of blue sattan and gold spots in it, with a sort of blue sattan cap and tassle of gold. He spoke all the time in English. . . . His house is not very fine, but genteel, and stands upon a mount close to the mountains. He is tall and very thin, has a very piercing eye, and a look singularly vivacious. He told me of his acquaintance with Pope, Swift (with whom he lived for three months at Lord Peterborough's) and Gay, who first showed him the "Beggar's Opera" before it was acted. He says he admires Swift, and loved Gay vastly. He said that Swift had a great deal of the *ridiculum acre*.'

And then Major Broome goes on to describe the 'handsome 'new church' at Ferney, and the 'very neat waterworks' at Geneva. But what a vision has he opened out for us, and, in that very moment, shut away for ever from our gaze in that brief parenthesis—'with whom he lived for three months 'at Lord Peterborough's'! What would we not give now for no more than one or two of the bright imperishable drops from that noble river of talk which flowed then with such a careless abundance!—that prodigal stream, swirling away, so swiftly and so happily, into the empty spaces of forgetfulness and the long night of Time!

So complete, indeed, is the lack of precise and well-authenticated information upon this, by far the most obviously interesting side of Voltaire's life in England, that some writers have been led to adopt a very different theory from that which is usually accepted, and to suppose that his relations with Pope's circle were in reality either of a purely superficial, or even of an actually disreputable, kind. Voltaire himself, no doubt, was anxious to appear as the intimate friend of the great writers of England; but what reason is there to believe that he was not embroidering upon the facts, and that his true position was not that of a mere literary hanger-on, eager simply for money and *réclame*, with, perhaps, no particular scruples as to his means of getting hold of those desirable ends? The objection to this theory is that there is even less evidence to support it than there is to support Voltaire's own story. There are a few rumours and anecdotes; but that is all. Voltaire was probably the best-hated man in the eighteenth century, and it is only natural that, out of the enormous mass of mud that was thrown at him, some handfuls should have been particularly aimed at his life in England. Accordingly, we learn that somebody was told by somebody else—'avec 'des détails que je ne rapporterai point'—that 'M. de Vol-'taire se conduisit très-irrégulièrement en Angleterre: qu'il 's'y est fait beaucoup d'ennemis, par des procédés qui 'n'accordaient pas avec les principes d'une morale exacte.' And we are told that he left England 'under a cloud'; that before he went he was 'cudgelled' by an infuriated publisher; that he swindled Lord Peterborough out of large sums of money, and that the outraged nobleman drew his sword upon the miscreant, who only escaped with his life by a midnight flight. A more circumstantial story has been given currency by Dr. Johnson. Voltaire, it appears, was a spy in the pay of Walpole, and was in the habit of betraying Bolingbroke's political secrets to the Government. The tale first appears in a third-rate life of Pope by Owen Ruffhead, who had it from Warburton, who had it from Pope himself. Oddly enough Churton Collins apparently believed it, partly upon the evidence afforded by the 'fulsome flattery' and 'exaggerated com-'pliments' to be found in Voltaire's correspondence, which, he says, reveal a man in whom 'falsehood and hypocrisy 'are of the very essence of his composition. There is nothing,

'however base, to which he will not stoop; there is no law 'in the code of social honour which he is not capable of vio-'lating.' Such an extreme and sweeping conclusion, following from such shadowy premises, seems to show that some of the mud thrown in the eighteenth century was still sticking in the twentieth. M. Foulet, however, has examined Ruffhead's charge in a very different spirit, with conscientious minuteness, and has concluded that it is utterly without foundation.

It is, indeed, certain that Voltaire's acquaintanceship was not limited to the extremely bitter Opposition circle which centred about the disappointed and restless figure of Bolingbroke. He had come to London with letters of introduction from Horace Walpole, the English Ambassador at Paris, to various eminent persons in the Government. 'Mr. Voltaire, 'a poet and a very ingenious one,' was recommended by Walpole to the favour and protection of the Duke of Newcastle, while Dodington was asked to support the subscription to 'an excellent poem, called "Henry IV.," which, on account 'of some bold strokes in it against persecution and the priests, 'cannot be printed here.' These letters had their effect, and Voltaire rapidly made friends at Court. When he brought out his London edition of the 'Henriade,' there was hardly a great name in England which was not on the subscription list. He was allowed to dedicate the poem to Queen Caroline, and he received a royal gift of £240. Now it is also certain that just before this time Bolingbroke and Swift were suspicious of a 'certain pragmatical spy of quality, well known to act 'in that capacity by those into whose company he insinuates 'himself,' who, they believed, was betraying their plans to the Government. But to conclude that this detected spy was Voltaire, whose favour at Court was known to be the reward of treachery to his friends, is, apart from the inherent improbability of the supposition, rendered almost impossible, owing to the fact that Bolingbroke and Swift were themselves subscribers to the 'Henriade'—Bolingbroke took no fewer than twenty copies—and that Swift was not only instrumental in obtaining a large number of Irish subscriptions, but actually wrote a preface to the Dublin edition of another of Voltaire's works. What inducement could Bolingbroke have had for such liberality towards a man who had betrayed him? Who can conceive of the redoubtable Dean of St. Patrick's, then

at the very summit of his fame, dispensing such splendid favours to a wretch whom he knew to be engaged in the shabbiest of all traffics at the expense of himself and his friends ?

Voltaire's literary activities were as insatiable while he was in England as during every other period of his career. Besides the edition of the 'Henriade,' which was considerably altered and enlarged—one of the changes was the silent removal of the name of Sully from its pages—he brought out a volume of two essays, written in English, upon the French Civil Wars and upon Epic Poetry, he began an adaptation of 'Julius 'Caesar' for the French stage, he wrote the opening acts of his tragedy of 'Brutus,' and he collected a quantity of material for his 'History of Charles XII.' In addition to all this, he was busily engaged with the preparations for his 'Lettres 'Philosophiques.' The 'Henriade' met with a great success. Every copy of the magnificent quarto edition was sold before publication ; three octavo editions were exhausted in as many weeks ; and Voltaire made a profit of at least ten thousand francs. M. Foulet thinks that he left England shortly after this highly successful transaction, and that he established himself secretly in some town in Normandy, probably Rouen, where he devoted himself to the completion of the various works which he had in hand. Be this as it may, he was certainly in France early in April 1729 ; a few days later he applied for permission to return to Paris ; this was granted on the 9th of April, and the remarkable incident which had begun at the Opéra more than three years before came to a close.

It was not until five years later that the 'Lettres 'Philosophiques' appeared. This epoch-making book was the lens by means of which Voltaire gathered together the scattered rays of his English impressions into a focus of brilliant and burning intensity. It so happened that the nation into whose midst he had plunged, and whose characteristics he had scrutinised with so avid a curiosity, had just reached one of the culminating moments in its history. The great achievement of the Revolution and the splendid triumphs of Marlborough had brought to England freedom, power, wealth, and that sense of high exhilaration which springs from victory and self-confidence. Her destiny was in the hands of an

aristocracy which was not only capable and enlightened, like most successful aristocracies, but which possessed the peculiar attribute of being deep-rooted in popular traditions and popular sympathies and of drawing its life-blood from the popular will. The agitations of the reign of Anne were over; the stagnation of the reign of Walpole had not yet begun. There was a great outburst of intellectual activity and æsthetic energy. The amazing discoveries of Newton seemed to open out boundless possibilities of speculation; and in the meantime the great nobles were building palaces and reviving the magnificence of the Augustan Age, while men of letters filled the offices of state. Never, perhaps, before or since, has England been so thoroughly English; never have the national qualities of solidity and sense, independence of judgment and idiosyncrasy of temperament, received a more forcible and complete expression. It was the England of Walpole and Carteret, of Butler and Berkeley, of Swift and Pope. The two works which, out of the whole range of English literature, contain in a supreme degree those elements of power, breadth, and common sense, which lie at the root of the national genius—'Gulliver's Travels' and the 'Dunciad'—both appeared during Voltaire's visit. Nor was it only in the high places of the nation's consciousness that these signs were manifest; they were visible everywhere, to every stroller through the London streets—in the Royal Exchange, where all the world came crowding to pour its gold into English purses, in the Meeting Houses of the Quakers, where the Holy Spirit rushed forth untrammelled to clothe itself in the sober garb of English idiom, and in the taverns of Cheapside, where the brawny fellow-countrymen of Newton and Shakespeare sat, in an impenetrable silence, over their English beef and English beer.

It was only natural that such a society should act as a powerful stimulus upon the vivid temperament of Voltaire, who had come to it with the bitter knowledge fresh in his mind of the medieval futility, the narrow-minded cynicism of his own country. Yet the book which was the result is in many ways a surprising one. It is almost as remarkable for what it does not say as for what it does. In the first place, Voltaire makes no attempt to give his readers an account of the outward surface, the social and spectacular aspects of

English life. It is impossible not to regret this, especially since we know, from a delightful fragment which was not published until after his death, describing his first impressions on arriving in London, in how brilliant and inimitable a fashion he would have accomplished the task. A full-length portrait of Hanoverian England from the personal point of view, by Voltaire, would have been a priceless possession for posterity; but it was never to be painted. The first sketch, revealing in its perfection the hand of the master, was lightly drawn, and then thrown aside for ever. And in reality it is better so. Voltaire decided to aim at something higher and more important, something more original and more profound. He determined to write a book which should be, not the sparkling record of an ingenious traveller, but a work of propaganda and a declaration of faith. That new mood, which had come upon him first in Sully's dining-room and is revealed to us in the quivering phrases of the note to Madame de Bernières, was to grow, in the congenial air of England, into the dominating passion of his life. Henceforth, whatever quips and follies, whatever flouts and mockeries might play upon the surface, he was to be in deadly earnest at heart. He was to live and die a fighter in the ranks of progress, a champion in the mighty struggle which was now beginning against the powers of darkness in France. The first great blow in that struggle had been struck ten years earlier by Montesquieu in his 'Lettres Persanes'; the second was struck by Voltaire in the 'Lettres Philosophiques.' The intellectual freedom, the vigorous precision, the elegant urbanity which characterise the earlier work appear in a yet more perfect form in the later one. Voltaire's book, as its title indicates, is in effect a series of generalised reflections upon a multitude of important topics, connected together by a common point of view. A description of the institutions and manners of England is only an incidental part of the scheme: it is the fulcrum by means of which the lever of Voltaire's philosophy is brought into operation. The book is an extremely short one—it fills less than two hundred small octavo pages; and its tone and style have just that light and airy gaiety which befits the ostensible form of it—a set of private letters to a friend. With an extraordinary width of comprehension, an extraordinary pliability of intelligence, Voltaire touches upon a hundred

subjects of the most varied interest and importance—from the theory of gravitation to the satires of Lord Rochester, from the effects of inoculation to the immortality of the soul—and every touch tells. It is the spirit of Humanism carried to its furthest, its quintessential point; indeed, at first sight, one is tempted to think that this quality of rarified universality has been exaggerated into a defect. The matters treated of are so many and so vast, they are disposed of and dismissed so swiftly, so easily, so unemphatically, that one begins to wonder whether, after all, anything of real significance can have been expressed. But, in reality, what, in those few small pages, has been expressed is simply the whole philosophy of Voltaire. He offers one an exquisite dish of whipped cream; one swallows down the unsubstantial trifle, and asks impatiently if that is all? At any rate, it is enough. Into that frothy sweetness his subtle hand has insinuated a single drop of some strange liquor—is it a poison or is it an elixir of life?—whose penetrating influence will spread and spread until the remotest fibres of the system have felt its power. Contemporary French readers, when they had shut the book, found somehow that they were looking out upon a new world; that a process of disintegration had begun among their most intimate beliefs and feelings; that the whole rigid framework of society—of life itself—the hard, dark, narrow, antiquated structure of their existence—had suddenly, in the twinkling of an eye, become a faded, shadowy thing.

It might have been expected that, among the reforms which such a work would advocate, a prominent place would certainly have been given to those of a political nature. In England a political revolution had been crowned with triumph, and all that was best in English life was founded upon the political institutions which had been then established. The moral was obvious: one had only to compare the state of England under a free government with the state of France, disgraced, bankrupt, and incompetent, under autocratic rule. But the moral is never drawn by Voltaire. His references to political questions are slight and vague; he gives a sketch of English history, which reaches Magna Charta, suddenly mentions Henry VII., and then stops; he has not a word to say upon the responsibility of Ministers, the independence of the judicature, or even the freedom of the press. He

approves of the English financial system, whose control by the Commons he mentions, but he fails to indicate the importance of the fact. As to the underlying principles of the constitution, the account which he gives of them conveys hardly more to the reader than the famous lines in the 'Henriade':

> 'Aux murs de Westminster on voit paraître ensemble
> Trois pouvoirs étonnés du nœud qui les rassemble.'

Apparently Voltaire was aware of these deficiencies, for in the English edition of the book he caused the following curious excuses to be inserted in the preface:

'Some of his *English* Readers may perhaps be dissatisfied at his not expatiating farther on their Constitution and their Laws, which most of them revere almost to Idolatry; but this Reservedness is an effect of *M. de Voltaire's* Judgment. He contented himself with giving his opinion of them in general Reflexions, the Cast of which is entirely new, and which prove that he had made this Part of the *British* Polity his particular Study. Besides, how was it possible for a Foreigner to pierce thro' their Politicks, that gloomy Labyrinth, in which such of the *English* themselves as are best acquainted with it, confess daily that they are bewilder'd and lost?'

Nothing could be more characteristic of the attitude, not only of Voltaire himself, but of the whole host of his followers in the later eighteenth century, towards the actual problems of politics. They turned away in disgust from the 'gloomy 'labyrinth' of practical fact to take refuge in those charming 'general Reflexions' so dear to their hearts, 'the Cast of which 'was entirely new'—and the conclusion of which was also entirely new, for it was the French Revolution.

It was, indeed, typical of Voltaire and of his age that the 'Lettres Philosophiques' should have been condemned by the authorities, not for any political heterodoxy, but for a few remarks which seemed to call in question the immortality of the soul. His attack upon the *ancien régime* was, in the main, a theoretical attack; doubtless its immediate effectiveness was thereby diminished, but its ultimate force was increased. And the *ancien régime* itself was not slow to realise the danger: to touch the ark of metaphysical orthodoxy was in its eyes the unforgivable sin. Voltaire knew well enough that he must be careful.

'Il n'y a qu'une lettre touchant M. Loke' [he wrote to a friend]. 'La seule matière philosophique que j'y traite est la petite bagatelle de l'immortalité de l'âme; mais la chose a trop de conséquence pour la traiter sérieusement. Il a fallu l'égorger pour ne pas heurter de front nos seigneurs les théologiens, gens qui voient si clairement la spiritualité de l'âme qu'ils feraient brûler, s'ils pouvaient, les corps de ceux qui en doutent.'

Nor was it only 'M. Loke' whom he felt himself obliged to touch so gingerly; the remarkable movement towards Deism, which was then beginning in England, Voltaire only dared to allude to in a hardly perceivable hint. He just mentions, almost in a parenthesis, the names of Shaftesbury, Collins, and Toland, and then quickly passes on. In this connexion, it may be noticed that the influence upon Voltaire of the writers of this group has often been exaggerated. To say, as Lord Morley says, that 'it was the English onslaught which sowed 'in him the seed of the idea . . . of a systematic and reasoned 'attack' upon Christian theology, is to misjudge the situation. In the first place it is certain both that Voltaire's opinions upon those matters were fixed, and that his proselytising habits had begun, long before he came to England. There is curious evidence of this in an anonymous letter, preserved among the archives of the Bastille, and addressed to the head of the police at the time of Voltaire's imprisonment.

'Vous venez de mettre à la Bastille' [says the writer, who, it is supposed, was an ecclesiastic] 'un homme que je souhaitais y voir il y a plus de 15 années.'

The writer goes on to speak of the

'métier que faisait l'homme en question, prêchant le déisme tout à découvert aux toilettes de nos jeunes seigneurs. . . . L'Ancien Testament, selon lui, n'est qu'un tissu de contes et de fables, les apôtres étaient de bonnes gens idiots, simples, et crédules, et les pères de l'Eglise, Saint Bernard surtout, auquel il en veut le plus, n'étaient que des charlatans et des suborneurs.'

'Je voudrais être homme d'autorité,' he adds, 'pour un jour 'seulement, afin d'enfermer ce poète entre quatre murailles 'pour toute sa vie.' That Voltaire at this early date should have already given rise to such pious ecclesiastical wishes shows clearly enough that he had little to learn from the deists of England. And, in the second place, the deists of England had very little to teach a disciple of Bayle, Fontenelle, and

Montesquieu. They were, almost without exception, a group of second-rate and insignificant writers whose 'onslaught' upon current beliefs was only to a faint extent 'systematic 'and reasoned.' The feeble and fluctuating rationalism of Toland and Wollaston, the crude and confused rationalism of Collins, the half-crazy rationalism of Woolston may each and all, no doubt, have furnished Voltaire with arguments and suggestions, but they cannot have seriously influenced his thought. Bolingbroke was a more important figure, and he was in close personal relation with Voltaire; but his controversial writings were clumsy and superficial to an extraordinary degree. As Voltaire himself said, 'in his works 'there are many leaves and little fruit; distorted expressions 'and periods intolerably long.' Tindal and Middleton were more vigorous; but their work did not appear until a later period. The masterly and far-reaching speculations of Hume belong, of course, to a totally different class.

Apart from politics and metaphysics, there were two directions in which the 'Lettres Philosophiques' did pioneer work of a highly important kind: they introduced both Newton and Shakespeare to the French public. The four letters on Newton show Voltaire at his best—succinct, lucid, persuasive, and bold. The few paragraphs on Shakespeare, on the other hand, show him at his worst. Their principal merit is that they mention his existence—a fact hitherto unknown in France; otherwise they merely afford a striking example of the singular contradiction in Voltaire's nature which made him a revolutionary in intellect and kept him a high Tory in taste. Never was such speculative audacity combined with such æsthetic timidity; it is as if he had reserved all his superstition for matters of art. From his account of Shakespeare, it is clear that he had never dared to open his eyes and frankly look at what he should see before him. All was 'barbare, dépourvu 'de bienséances, d'ordre, de vraisemblance'; in the hurly-burly he was dimly aware of a figured and elevated style, and of some few 'lueurs étonnantes'; but to the true significance of Shakespeare's genius he remained utterly blind.

Characteristically enough, Voltaire, at the last moment, did his best to reinforce his tentative metaphysical observations on 'M. Loke' by slipping into his book, as it were accidentally, an additional letter, quite disconnected from the rest of the

work, containing reflexions upon some of the 'Pensées' of Pascal. He no doubt hoped that these reflexions, into which he had distilled some of his most insidious venom, might, under cover of the rest, pass unobserved. But all his subterfuges were useless. It was in vain that he pulled wires and intrigued with high personages; in vain that he made his way to the aged Minister, Cardinal Fleury, and attempted, by reading him some choice extracts on the Quakers, to obtain permission for the publication of his book. The old Cardinal could not help smiling, though Voltaire had felt that it would be safer to skip the best parts—'the poor man!' he said afterwards, 'he didn't realise what he had missed'—but the permission never came. Voltaire was obliged to have recourse to an illicit publication; and then the authorities acted with full force. The 'Lettres Philosophiques' were officially condemned; the book was declared to be scandalous and 'contraire à la religion, aux bonnes mœurs, et au respect 'dû aux puissances,' and it was ordered to be publicly burned by the executioner. The result was precisely what might have been expected: the prohibitions and fulminations, so far from putting a stop to the sale of such exciting matter, sent it up by leaps and bounds. England suddenly became the fashion; the theories of M. Loke and Sir Newton began to be discussed; even the plays of 'ce fou de Shakespeare' began to be read. And, at the same time, the whispered message of tolerance, of free inquiry, of enlightened curiosity, was carried over the land. The success of Voltaire's work was complete.

He himself, however, had been obliged to seek refuge from the wrath of the government in the remote seclusion of Madame du Châtelet's country house at Cirey. In this retirement he pursued his studies of Newton, and a few years later produced an exact and brilliant summary of the work of the great English philosopher. Once more the authorities intervened, and condemned Voltaire's book. The Newtonian system destroyed that of Descartes, and Descartes still spoke in France with the voice of orthodoxy; therefore, of course, the voice of Newton must not be heard. But, somehow or other, the voice of Newton *was* heard. The men of science were converted to the new doctrine; and thus it is not too much to say that the wonderful advances in the study of mathematics which

took place in France during the later years of the eighteenth century were the result of the illuminating zeal of Voltaire.

With his work on Newton, Voltaire's direct connexion with English influences came to an end. For the rest of his life, indeed, he never lost his interest in England; he was never tired of reading English books, of being polite to English travellers, and of doing his best, in the intervals of more serious labours, to destroy the reputation of that deplorable English buffoon, whom, unfortunately, he himself had been so foolish as first to introduce to the attention of his countrymen. But it is curious to notice how, as time went on, the force of Voltaire's nature inevitably carried him further and further away from the central standpoints of the English mind. The stimulus which he had received in England only served to urge him into a path which no Englishman has ever trod. The movement of English thought in the eighteenth century found its perfect expression in the profound, sceptical, and yet essentially conservative, genius of Hume. How different was the attitude of Voltaire! With what a reckless audacity, what a fierce uncompromising passion he charged and fought and charged again! He had no time for the nice discriminations of an elaborate philosophy, and no desire for the careful balance of the judicial mind; his creed was simple and explicit, and it also possessed the supreme merit of brevity: 'Écrasez l'infâme!' was enough for him.

LYTTON STRACHEY.

POPULAR POETRY

1. **English History in Contemporary Poetry.** Five volumes. No. i. —The Fourteenth Century. By Professor HERBERT BRUCE, M.A. No. ii.—Lancaster and York: 1399 to 1485. By CHARLES LETHBRIDGE KINGSFORD, M.A. No. iii.—The Tudor Monarchy: 1485 to 1588. By N. L. FRAZER, M.A. No. iv.—Court and Parliament: 1588 to 1688. By Professor F. J. C. HEARNSHAW, M.A., LL.D. No. v.—The Eighteenth Century. By Miss C. L. THOMSON, F.R.Hist.S. Bell. 1914.
2. **Oxford Garlands.** Five volumes:—Patriotic Poems; Love Poems; Religious Poems; Sonnets; Poems on Sport. Selected by R. M. LEONARD. Oxford University Press. 1914.
3. **Broad-Sheet Ballads.** Being a Collection of Irish Popular Songs, with an Introduction by PADRAIC COLUM. Maunsel. 1914.
4. **The Sea's Anthology.** From the Earliest Times down to the Middle of the Nineteenth Century. Compiled and edited with Notes, Introduction, and an Appendix by J. E. PATTERSON. Heinemann. 1913.

POPULAR poetry is a vague phrase that needs a close scrutiny. In a certain sense it is a contradiction in terms. Any kind of popularity—even in the narrowest use of the word—implies an aggregate. The unit of such an aggregate is, roughly, 'the man in the street'—a man so situated, that is, as to permit a more aloof spectator, at some intellectual upper window, 'to look down on him.' We one and all of us exist by virtue of our resemblances to our fellow-creatures, but in a sense we flourish as individuals by virtue of our differences from them. Few are so spiritually homeless as to have no isolated pinnacle from which in self-satisfaction to survey the groundlings. None is so spiritually unique as not to be compelled to descend at times, and to become a mere unit in the busy, heedless multitude of humanity that swarms in the by-ways and crowds about the booths of Vanity Fair. At any rate, it is as well to remember that in the very use of the word 'popular,' or 'popularity,' we are tacitly arrogating to ourselves some kind of a superiority. As often

as not it is the specialist's, the spectator's, easiest means of shrugging his shoulders at the mob.

A poet is in much the same relationship to the majority of his fellow-creatures as in his most poetic moments he is to himself. The more universal the poetic consciousness, the wider its range of imaginative insight and sympathy. The more individual and isolated, the less likely it is to win what may be called a popular appreciation. The highest poetry indeed reveals a penetration, a power of vision, a mystical sense beyond the reach of any but its maker to grasp in their completeness. Blake, for instance, is in such a solitude. Take that amazing poem, his 'War Song to English-'men,' included in Mr. Leonard's anthology of 'Patriotic 'Poems':

> 'Whose fatal scroll is that? Methinks 'tis mine!
> Why sinks my heart, why faltereth my tongue?
> Had I three lives, I'd die in such a cause,
> And rise, with ghosts, over the well-fought field.
> Prepare, prepare!
>
> The arrows of Almighty God are drawn!
> Angels of death stand in the lowering heavens!
> Thousands of souls must seek the realms of light,
> And walk together on the clouds of heaven!
> Prepare, prepare!' . . .

Are these angels the angels of 'Rule, Britannia'; these ghosts 'the forms unseen' who sing the dirge of the brave, blest, in death, by their country's wishes? Did any heart ever sink as sinks this heart? Has any human eye other than Blake's scanned those lowering heavens? Has any heart other than Shakespeare's shuddered at death's 'thick-'ribb'd ice'? Though all poets, then, share in a general distinction, they differ more sharply and intrinsically from one another than do ordinary mortals, as much, at any rate, as Dick in love differs from Harry enamoured, and both of them from Tom a-cold upon the wild and crooked borders of Bedlam. We think of Donne, of Shelley, of Keats, of Coleridge. Their words have proved them poets. Their words no less clearly have revealed personalities as far sundered from each other as it is possible for human personalities to be. The lower we get in the scale as regards poetic achievement, the less essential, the less spiritual becomes the

distinction. And Wordsworth, a supreme poet in his supreme hours, when the sovereign impulse fails him and he is merely pursuing the habit of writing verse, differs from Byron, similarly engaged, only as much and as accidentally as the general outside look of a clergyman differs from that of a man about town. Certainly no more arid monotony of appearance could be discovered than that shared by all mere elegant poetasters. The uninspired son of the prophet is not aggrandised, but eclipsed, by the mantle of Elisha.

In popular poetry, therefore, it would be natural to find expressed and reflected such qualities of mind and heart in their natural relation and balance as we are conscious of in our workaday selves and in ordinary men and women. But still those qualities heightened and enriched by the rarer emotions, the rarer enthusiasms. Only a small proportion of the poems in the anthologies compiled by Mr. Leonard and by Mr. Patterson can be in this sense really popular. The majority of their selections are essential poetry, and essential poetry appeals not to the many but to the few. As the scale of excellence descends — when sentiment sweetens into sentimentality, pathos melts into tearfulness, romance thins into romanticism, pure thought becomes vague and diffuse—the audience increases. Moore and Longfellow will always attract a wider circle of readers than can Marvell or Coleridge. The best survives of its own pure virtue. The less excellent slowly fades, because each generation in turn can substitute for it the poetic expression of its own passing fashions, thoughts, and ideals. The simplest, most rudimentary poetry, however, has a fascination all its own. Whatever beauty, naturalness, vigour, gaiety it may possess are none the less precious because they can be universally appreciated and enjoyed. The briar rose is but 'a worky-day 'fortune,' but welcome in the dust and heat. And, as Hurrell Froude wrote in his essay on 'The Causes of the Superior 'Excellence of the Poetry of Rude Ages,' 'In the effusions of 'uncultivated minds there is a sort of transparency in every 'word; and we can trace the genuine emotions of the heart in 'every epithet and simile.' Such crude effusions may of course jag the edge of an exquisite culture, but there is at any rate abundant evidence to prove that the greatest of all poets, the creator of Snug and Bottom and Audrey and

Doll and Mouldy and Costard and Verges, delighted in and laughed at the raw, racy, virgin earthiness of every popular poem that came his way. Hamlet himself had by heart 'Jepha, Judge of Israel':

> 'When Jepha did perceive and see
> His daughter firm and formostly,
> He rent his clothes and tore his haire,
> And shrieked out most piteously,
> "For thou art she" (quoth he)
> "Hath brought me low, alas for woe,
> And troubled me so,
> That I cannot tell what to doe, to doe."'

Ophelia's rosemary was plucked from 'A nosegaie alwaies 'sweet' of verse, and Sir Toby Belch knew by rhymed hearsay of 'a man in Babylon' with a wife of the name of Susanna. Is there indeed a play of Shakespeare's that is not enriched by some old tag of doggerel and song? 'Scorn not 'the sonnet, critic,' pleaded Wordsworth, but in actual fact the critic in the abstract is apt to fall victim to a less venial, a more mortal sin. He is courtesy itself to any exotic, to any plant of intensive and exquisite culture. He wastes neither time nor pains on the rough, lawless, overgrown field of popular poetry.

That field is certainly a good deal obstructed with weeds. But, good grain and indifferent, it bears three distinct crops :— poetry (intended by cultivated and well-meaning writers) *for* the people, poetry (whatever its motive) written *to* the people, and poetry written *by* the people. The first of these kinds is usually of an instructive and moralising order. Inspired by the best of motives, it is apt to have a slightly condescending or pedagogic tone. During his lifetime its author may enjoy an applause so sonorous that the whisper of criticism is hushed. He dies ; and the dust of oblivion softly enshrouds his numbers. Lovers of the antique and curious may still read Tusser's 'Goode Pointes of Husbandrie and Husserie,' Phineas Fletcher's 'Purple Island,' Erasmus Darwin's 'Loves of the Plants,' and reap the reward of the diligent. But the bread of the feast is now a little dry, the sack has all but evaporated. And though one memory at least retains from a far-away childhood a reverberating fragment of sound sense from a once popular didactic poet :—'A letter timely writ is a Rivet in the Chain

'of Affection: a Letter untimely delayed is as Rust to the Solder,' —the name of Tupper is now even more proverbial than his philosophy. Pope and Crabbe, Matthew Arnold and Mrs. Hemans, Tennyson—the greater poets in their less poetic moments, the lesser poets more or less habitually—exhibit this tendency. And Milton himself, had he not been a supreme poet, would have remained a tyrannous theologian.

It is the assured acquisition of 'a public,' aided perhaps by the treacheries of age, that dulls the fire of young imagination and sets beauty astray. The laurel is a poisonous plant. People who flourish on sermons—in prose or verse, who live to be edified, are legion, and the lure of the pulpit is insidious. Mr. Kipling is a man of genius. His verse is loaded with its ore. But would his poetry alone, freed from the comminatory and from every trace of the nine and thirty Articles of Imperialism, have so seized on the national attention? The Empire's the debt, and that a considerable one—but essential poetry is rare. Miss Ella Wheeler Wilcox, too, whose genius is less apparent, but who counts her readers as Samson counted the slaughtered Philistines, is primarily a preacher. Even her poems of 'passion' must allure fewer victims than her New Thought. Elevating verse tends towards the tract on the one hand, the hymn on the other, and each has its virtue and office. Both are enormously popular; but neither is necessarily related to poetry. For in spite of Dennis's conviction that 'sacred poems must be greater than profane 'ones can be, supposing equality of genius and equal art in 'the writers,' Johnson's view is the sounder:—'Let no pious 'ear be offended if I advance, in opposition to many authori-'ties, that poetical devotion cannot often please . . . All that 'pious verse can do is to help the memory and delight the ear, 'and for these purposes it may be very useful, but it supplies 'nothing to the mind.'

As for the poetry written to the people and by the people, that, too, supplies uncommonly little to the *mind*. 'The thing 'itself rather than thoughts about it' is its objective. It is more physical than spiritual. It does not educate; it shares. There was indeed a time when such poetry 'was a greater 'force than the newspaper,' when it was a true reflection of the national consciousness. An admirable series, 'English 'History in Contemporary Poetry,' recently published by the

Historical Association, affords an excellent bird's-eye view of this poetry in its relation to public events. Its activities were by no means in obvious proportion to its opportunities. The loss of Calais, the Spanish Armada, the voyagings of the Elizabethan seamen—all that awakening of wonder, that broadening of man's conception of the world—seem to have been left practically unrecorded; though the Gunpowder Plot fired many a squib in rhyme, and Drake was enshrined in a ballad:—

> 'Then came the Lord Chamberlain with his white staff,
> And all the people began to laugh,
> And then the Queen began to speak,
> "You are welcome home, Sir Francis Drake."'

The later writers were political poets, or professional politicians, with a (limited) gift for verse. The poet as such, high or humble, has always been more concerned with his own private life, 'with the sufferings of Hell, the joys of Heaven, the Seven 'Deadly Sins, and the like,' than with the desiccated facts of the historian. From the days of Gower and of *Piers Plowman* to those of Burns and Barnes and Clare and Bloomfield and Ebenezer Elliott there has been an almost continuous stream of poetry concerned with the common difficulties, hopes and fears and aspirations of the people. History almost tediously repeats itself; human experience never. Everyman renews in himself the great heart that suffers, must face that strange, perplexing, astonishingly vivid novelty, life. All tarred with the same brush, Englishmen have never languished for want of a grievance. The woes of the past are the social problems of the present. Professor Herbert Bruce has compiled from contemporary poetry an extensive catalogue of fourteenth-century wrongs and scandals. None of them is unfamiliar to the twentieth—the pride, luxury, and selfishness of the rich, 'Whereas with harpes, lutes, and giternes they 'daunce and pleye at dees bothe day and night'; the craftiness of lawyers; the quackery of doctors; the worldliness of the clergy. Five centuries ago unemployment sighed in vain for the Labour Bureau; the payment of Members of Parliament was already a bone of contention. Even in the Ark 'upstart 'gentlemen' and their ladies, who could neither delve nor spin, were probably to be seen, rocked on the flood, and dining off

' parcel gilt.' Kings and governments may come and go, the man in the street goes on for ever. A congress of his representatives, of ' the crowds of kerb and rut,' from all the ruinous cities the world has ever seen—Tyre, Thebes, Babylon, Nineveh —would soon be at home together. The Tower of Babel itself must have been raised to the strains of a popular song.

Within twenty years of the invention of printing the French press foamed with the nation's poetical tracts, farces and *contes*. The English produced the ' Broadside,' which from its first high office of scattering royal proclamations and papal indulgences, soon sank to the trade of disseminating doggerel. And doggerel is best not read in the lump. A rough examination, however, of such a collection as ' Black Letter Ballads and ' Broadsides,' of the date 1559–1597, proves, what one might expect, that Martin Tupper and Miss Wilcox are in the direct line of popular poets. Godly and pleasant posies of exhortation abound. Many of these derive their unction from monstrosities. Edification and gloating curiosity strive for mastery.

> ' Come neere, good Christians all,
> Behold a monster rare,
> Whose monstrous shape, no doubt, fortels
> God's wrath we should beware. . . .'

The first shark seen in Billyngesgate, in June 1569, moved no man to point a moral or adorn the tale, though every tortured limb of the offspring of ' a naughty packe of Maydstone ' (born at seven o'clock on a Sunday, too) inspired a caustic jeremiad. Muche Hookesleye and Chichester also supplied such opportunities. But divine wrath on these occasions visited parents of honest and quiet conversation, though Mrs. Anthony Smith of Hookesleye had a narrow escape. The ' Balade of a Priest that loste his nose For sayinge of a ' masse, as I suppose,' and ' The brainles blessing of a Bull ' are examples of another obvious variety. Three familiar stories are included, Patient Grissill's, Maudlin's (the merchant's daughter of Bristol), and the lamentable history (in forty-one lumbering stanzas) of the fair Widow of Watling Street, her three daughters, and her ' ungratious ' son. Ravens picked out the eyes at last of this bowelless young man. But in spite of this tragic *dénouement* there is a faint but unmistakable flavour of Jane Austen about him. Fire, plague, tempest, murder and

sudden death win due recognition. As regards love, there is no rumour of Donne's 'Love's mysteries in souls do grow,' of Campion's 'fair sun,' of Shelley's 'Life of life'; but there is at least one little song with a haunting onset,—

'Adewe, sweete Harte, adewe!
Syth we must part!
To lose the loue of you
It greaves my harte.'

For the rest, we have 'As pleasant a dittie as your hart can 'wish, shewing what vnkindness befell by a kisse,' a ditty which is perhaps just 'worth a beane.' The 'merie' ballads, the ditties delightful are always emphatically distinguished from the 'proper' ballads and 'sonnets.' They are of the kind usually specified in literary circles as 'licentious.' Their humour is broad and British, the tang distinctly pungent. Well might the author of the 'Counterblast' inquire,—'Tel me, is Christ 'or Cupide lord? Doth God or Venus raigne?' But such things are wholesomeness itself compared with the semi-genteel jocosities of the 'Pills to Purge Melancholy,' collected by Charles II.'s *protégé*, Thomas D'Urfey. Addison found D'Urfey a cheerful, honest, good-natured man and a diverting companion. His own modest claim to attention was 'a double Genius 'for *Poetry* and *Musick*.' That genius mainly consisted of an impeccable nose for such 'old pieces' for 'the publick Stock' as would be likely to beguile the Lords, Ladies, and Gentry of his time in their 'merry and vacant hours'—hours that may have been merry but must have been very vacant.

'Come, buy my new Ballad,
I have't in my Wallet,
But 'twill not, I fear, please every pallat.'

Railing wives, 'jolly' town-rakes, 'kind' ladies, 'wanton' shepherdesses, the 'joys' of beggary—the characters, subjects, pathos, humour, wit, and, above all, the style of these pieces, prove that when English poetry sank to its most stagnant ebb in the eighteenth century the popular ballads of the late seventeenth were the flotsam that rotted on its fringe. Such a phrase as 'My Handsome Gilderoy,' such a line as 'As I 'walk'd forth one summer's day,' a piece of rollicking braggadocio like Jordan's 'Let's drink and be mery, Dance, Joke and

'Rejoice,' suggest a soul of some kind of goodness, but one soon realises that neither fine lady nor coy dairymaid is likely to be, as was Lady Godiva, 'much abash'd in mind' by any 'strange 'demand,' and only one kind of adventure awaits the fatuous gallant. D'Urfey was a parasite. Most of his balladists were fry of even less specific gravity than the doggerelisers who were to set the streets of a later London ringing with '*Viva* Victoria' and 'Lovely Albert,' with 'Vilikins and his Dinah' and 'The One-horse Shay.' And modern taste would prefer any kind of melancholy to the sugar, even, of his pills.

Thomas Evans and his son were true enthusiasts. They anticipated the scrupulous editorship of our own day, were intent only on 'the legitimate productions of our early Minstrels.' Ritson is gravely rebuked in their Advertisement for his vulgar abuse of Bishop Percy, but all that venerable prelate's additions and emendations in the text of his 'Reliques' are severely expurgated. The Evanses rifled the Roxburghe and Pepys collections, commandeering many old 'rarities,' and their four volumes of 'Old Ballads' are a feast of Englishness. Jovial blades and shrews and topers, marriageable young ladies of fourteen, calculating and imbecile virgins, jealous wives, doltish husbands, and the like, may be encountered in their pages. But there is no gloss of gentility, no patronising smirk. These ballads are faithful copies of the old full-flavoured wares of the ballad-monger. Here and there the clear and solitary flower of some exquisite little poem breaks the clod, the Coventry Carol, a slumber-song of 1530, a lullaby from 'The Pleasant Comodie of Patient 'Grissil,' 'Golden slumbers kisse your eyes.' These are rare. But the earth is good English earth, grows hawthorn and the Maypole's greenery. Now it is 'York, York for my monie'; now 'The Stout Cripple of Cornwall.' 'The Wanton Wife 'of Bath' hobnobs with the 'Marchant's Sonne of London,' the beggar wench of Hull, the false-hearted lass of Limehouse, and fair Susan of Somersetshire. Elizabeth's Essex and Henry's six queens are guests with Samson and Bathsheba. A dead man tells of his journey:

> 'The bells rung out, my friends came in,
> And I key cold was found,
> Then was my carcase brought from bed
> And cast upon the ground.'

This key-cold shade forthwith enters a city of pearls and diamonds, of houses tiled and overlaid with beaten gold, of uncankerable gilly-flowers and carnations, of music, mirth and melody, and then his 'fair young man' turns him round about to view 'the other side' and its inhabitants, including a particularly ugly corpse :

'About his neck were fiery ruffs,
That flamed on every side ;
I ask'd, and lo ! the young man said,
That he was damn'd for pride. . . .'

Our forefathers were men of a vigorous stomach. They revelled in phantasmal pitch and brimstone and could enjoy no less the unimaginary horrors of the last hours of Arden of Feversham and of Edward II., precisely as their descendants enjoyed the melodrama of Crippen, the epic of Charles Peace. An occasional orgy of silliness was just as welcome. 'A Courtly 'New Ballad of the princely Wooing of the fair maid of London 'by King Edward' is this silliness *in excelsis*. 'The Phoenix 'so famous that liveth alone,' argues the royal schemer, 'Is 'vowed to chastity, being but one.' He promises promotion and honour. He is candid.

'Two brides young and princely to church I have led,
Two ladies most lovely have decked my bed.'

But his 'darling' is adamant, 'O wanton King Edward, 'thy labour is vain,' and there is nothing left for her to do but to commit her 'sad burial' to an England that in life could afford her 'no comforts.' Or take another piece of succulent absurdity :

'Then in his shirt of cambrick,
With silks most richly wrought,
This worthy London 'prentice
Was from the prison brought,
And to the lions given
To staunch their hunger great,
Which had not eat in ten days' space
Not one small bit of meat. . . .'

This bold young man finally converted the Grand Turk to a true respect for England by thrusting his arms into the monsters' throats and tearing their hearts asunder.

All this crudeness is of a genuine naïveté, thickly gilded with romance. These ingenuous balladists, whoever they were, had at least one indispensable poetic faculty: they make us *see* what is going on, however incredible or rudimentary such goings-on may be. 'Society News' to-day links the classes with the masses. Never revels multi-millionaire in a manner befitting his money-bags but Lazarus is fed on the (printed) crumbs next morning. In the old days, ballad and broadside kept rich and poor more truly in touch. They humanise, live into, their great folk, though they prefer them in adversity. Many are the stories in 'sound Dunstable doggerel' of such headlong lamentable falls from fame and splendour as that of the 'unfortunate concubine Rosamond,' doleful Anne Boleyn, and 'the Dutchess of Gloucester, wife to good Duke Humphrey':

> 'The silver Thames, that sweetly pleas'd mine eye,
> Procur'd me golden thoughts of majesty;
> The kind content and murmurs of the water
> Made me forget the woes that would come after.' (!)
>
> 'My coaches and my stately pamper'd steeds,
> Well furnish'd in their gold-betrapped weeds,
> With gentle glidings in the summer nights,
> Still yielded me the evening's sweet delights. . .'

And then the duchess's noble lord, disgraced and cast into prison, is murdered in his sleep. But though Ellinor is turned out of door she will 'a lady still remain'—a perfect lady—and she practises witchcraft:

> 'Red streaming blood fell down my azur'd veins,
> To make characters in round circled stains;
> With dead men's skulls, by brimstone burned quite,
> To raise the dreadful shadows of the night. . .'

But heaven routs even these black arts, and Ellinor is doomed, sheeted and barefoot, to walk each London street in penance. That accomplished, for full nineteen years she pines vainly in the Isle of Man for Greenwich towers, and her decease is truly lyrical:

> 'Ring out my knell, you birds in top of sky;
> Quite tir'd with woes, here Ellinor must die.
> Receive me, earth, into thy gentle womb;
> A banish'd lady craves no other tomb. . .'

These old ballad-writers sang of war on land and on sea as lustily as they sang of love and murder and monstrosities, of God's wrath and His mercy, of wreck and tempest, press-gang and cannibal feast, Tom Thumb and Robin Hood. All in good season they could troll the nefarious Lillibullero, and 'Here's a health' and 'O what's the rhyme to 'porringer?' and 'Up and rin awa', Willie,' with just such a gusto as, in the most triumphant retreat in our English annals, our British soldiers the other day sang coolness and endurance into their hearts to the wistful, haunting strains of 'It's a long way to Tipperary.' Bluff, devil-may-care feats of braggartry and foolhardiness, enriched with the ripest sentiment, in halting or headlong marrowy metre, never failed to take their fancy—single combats, prince against prince, man against many, ship against fleet. They particularly enjoyed ecstatic reunions—when handsome Sal in male attire flings herself upon the surcharged bosom of her long-lost mariner. They loved beauty and innocence, but rather in the tangible form of sweetheart and children than in the abstract of the metaphysical poets. They had their earnest doubts at times regarding their immortal souls, their fits of remorse in dense ashes and the harshest sackcloth, but in ease and plenty they were more concerned with their mortal bodies. 'Tis often 'I sat on my true love's knee,' runs 'Shuile Agra' from Mr. Padraic Colum's delightful anthology, with 'stockings of silk, 'and shoes of fine green leather'; and Jack of Portsmouth trolls reply:

> 'And when we come to Portsmouth,
> With a girl on each knee
> We'll spend our money cheerfully
> And then again to sea. . .'

And when it comes to the end of all things, however abrupt and unforeseen, it must be faced with the quiet exemplary courage of the poacher who avenged the death of his mate, poor Bill Brown, or of Larry on the night before he was 'stretched':

> '"I'm sorry, dear Larry," says I,
> "To see you in this situation;
> And, blister my limbs if I lie,
> I'd as lieve it had been my own station."

" Ochone ! it's all over," says he,
" For the neck-cloth I'll be forced to put on,
And by this time to-morrow you'll see
Your poor Larry as dead as a mutton,
Because, why, his courage was good. . ." '

Whatever the warp may be—and it is astonishingly various—the woof of this true old poetry of the people is the same: coarse, vigorous, gaudy and endurable. And the life of the nation is woven in with its threads. Is there any hope or prospect of the active continuance of this tradition ? Has cheap journalism dealt it a mortal blow ? Is Mr. Anon at last gone to his grave under the cypress tree ? For, unless *his* spirit is immortal, this balladry of chapbook and broadside, with all its unsophisticated charms, its defiance of technical finish, is doomed to take its place among the dead languages. Poets are of no particular class or birth. Henry VIII. was something of a poet, Villon was something of a thief. But the Republic of Letters at least tends towards an aristocracy; genius will ever go its own strange, lonely way. And though of recent years many volumes of verse have been published with an avowed but purely accidental claim to public interest based on the fact that their writers have sprung direct from the people, their intrinsic merit has for the most part been a literary one. The common weakness of such verse—a tendency towards the rhetorical, the ' poetical,' the introspective—is literary too. Is a deliberate return to an old and bygone manner practicable, desirable ? Can a bridge be built between the exquisite and the homely, and the grown-up enjoy *his* nursery rhymes ? Is it indeed within the power of the conscious craftsman, versed in the complete cult of syzygy, epanaphora, and enjambment, to fling off his embroidered singing robes and turn Old Adam again ? Mr. Yeats long since cast a yearning glance in this direction. ' My work,' he writes in a brief essay entitled ' Personality and the Intellectual Essences,'

' My work in Ireland has continually set the thought before me: " How can I make my work mean something to vigorous and " simple men whose attention is not given to art but to a shop, " or teaching in a National School, or dispensing medicine ? " . . . In England . . . one only escapes from crudities and temporary interests among students, but here there is a right audience could one but get its ears . . . There are two ways before literature—

upward into evergrowing subtlety, with Verhaeren, with Mallarmé, with Maeterlinck, until at last, it may be, a new agreement among refined and studious men gives birth to a new passion, and what seems literature becomes religion ; or downward, taking the soul with us until all is simplified and solidified again. That is the choice of choices—the way of the bird until common eyes have lost us, or to the market carts.'

All eyes are very busy and anxious just now. And common tongues were ever notoriously ignorant of the names even of the most melodious and beautiful birds that sing in heaven. But if any poet, a little weary of his invisibility in the intense inane, should pine for a perch on the waggoner's tilt, he should have at least, what Mr. Yeats claims for him in his ' Poetry ' and Tradition '—' the freedom of the well-bred,' and being ' bred to the tact of words he can take what theme he pleases.' Immune from external shock, every art tends towards a too exhaustive culture. It shuts its doors against a dull and noisy world, and its followers are in danger of being stifled in the fume of their own incense. Even this last summer's extravagances seem now prophetic. The shock has come. In 1815 London was listening to a street song entitled ' The Wonderful Wonders of Town.' ' Good neighbour, ' pray listen,' this ' rym dogerel ' begins :

' The streets 'luminated I walked every night,
And the devil a bit I could see for the light ;
Such pictures, lamps, feathers, stars, anchors, and jokes,
With Boney, the devil, and all sorts of volks. . .'

' Then the Cossack Horse Soldiers as fought with our foes,
We kill'd 'em with kindness, as all the world knows,
And gave 'em such welcome and hearty good cheer,
They'd no time to get shaved all the time they were here.

' One word more—of all sights that in town I did see,
There was one sight worth all the whole bundle to me,
Great Wellington's self, who has made the world ring
With glory, God bless him, and God save the King ! '

Next year will be this raw ballad's centenary. It may be that by then peace will have come again, at what cost of life and beauty, and by virtue of what courage, hardihood, faith and loyalty, we already in part foresee. Another Boney may then, we may fervently hope, have learned his lesson. The Cossack

Horse Soldiers will have been re-killed with kindness, and true sons of Wellington and of Nelson will have won all blessing. That is our trust. Meantime, all that has gone before is in the melting-pot. Human consciousness is only beginning to grasp and measure the vital and spiritual significance of the cause that is at stake. But since, in Mr. Kingsford's words in his survey of the fifteenth century, 'When great 'national achievements are common, ballads will be good and 'true,' since, as Puttenham said, 'Poesie is more ancient 'than the artificiall of the Greeks and Latines,' there is this little incidental hope for the lover of English literature: that, given so momentous, all-moving an occasion, the people, the ancient people of England, may wake to their own poetry again, even *write* it, as they did of old, for themselves.

WALTER DE LA MARE.

THE FUTURE OF CHINA

1. **Problems of Power.** By William Morton Fullerton. Constable.
2. **The Chinese People.** By the Ven. Archdeacon Arthur Evans Moule. S.P.C.K.
3. **The Regeneration of New China.** By Nelson Bitton. United Council for Missionary Education.
4. **With the Russians in Mongolia.** By H. G. C. Perry-Ayscough and Captain R. B. Otter-Barry. Lane.
5. **The Question of Outer Mongolia.** By W. W. Rockhill. Monograph of the Asiatic Institute, U.S.A.

IN an article published in this 'Review' two years ago, an attempt was made to show that the expulsion of the Manchus in 1911 was not the result of conscious political aspirations on the part of the Chinese people, but merely an episode, the natural conclusion of a long-drawn period of deep-rooted unrest. Such crises may be traced throughout the whole course of Chinese history, in almost rhythmical series, to a social system which has persistently inculcated principles of passive resistance, together with a chronic tendency towards over-population. It was further argued that the preservation of China's ancient civilisation, the gradual alleviation of her fast-pressing troubles, and the future maintenance of her national independence, cannot possibly be attained by any rearrangement of her form of government, but only by means of educational processes, steadily applied, which shall radically modify the nation's social and economic systems. Since then, the history of the Republic, during the three years of its existence, has proved, even to those who believe most firmly in the regenerating virtue of political formulae as a cure for social and economic evils, that the fundamental determinant of the destinies of the Chinese people lies to-day, as it has done for ages, in the fierceness of their struggle for bare existence. That lesson has once again been writ large, from one end of

the country to the other, in the sack of populous cities, in the devastation of whole provinces by fire and sword, in widespread havoc by freebooters and pirates, and in systematic plundering by the undisciplined rabble known as Government troops. Once the traditional prestige of Peking's authority had been broken, not all the fervent eloquence of Parliamentary delegates, nor any proclamation of a Constitution, could save the common people from these grievous pains and penalties. And now Young China's little hour of brief authority has passed, leaving behind it only bitter memories of futile catchwords and devastating strife.

To-day, if we may judge from surface indications of the general condition of the country, the paroxysm of disorder has spent itself from sheer exhaustion. On the one hand, economic pressure has been relieved in many provinces by the unrecorded taking-off of countless lives; on the other, the strong hand of authority, which alone can protect life and property in China from the hand of the lawless and the desperate, is slowly but surely recovering its hold, as the result of Yuan Shih-k'ai's restoration of autocratic government. Despite the continued prevalence of piracy in Kuangtung and of brigandage in the north-western provinces, there is justification for the belief that the country has entered upon a period of recuperation. Given good harvests, normal facilities for trade, and something approaching to effective authority at the centre of government, the ceaseless industry of the thrifty toiling millions may be expected speedily to make good the ravages of the recent upheaval. Unmoved by all its immemorial experience, it will then proceed to sow the seeds of new disorders in time to come, by blind obedience to its racial traditions of procreative recklessness: for such have ever been the unchanging cycles of Cathay, and such they must continue to be, until the foundations of a new type of State shall have been securely laid in its schools and colleges.

Assuming that the state of exhaustion brought about by the disorders and disasters of the past three years will now be followed by a period of national convalescence, we are nevertheless confronted by the fact, which these disasters have emphasised, that the immediate future of China as an independent nation depends entirely upon Yuan Shih-k'ai's ability

to organise, in the time and from the materials at his disposal, a system of administration strong and stable enough to arrest the forces of disintegration working from without, and those of demoralisation within. If he should live to govern the country for the next ten years, what are the chances of his succeeding in that stupendous task ? And if he should suddenly be removed, what then ? The process of disintegration, which became plainly visible to every careful observer after China's disastrous war with Japan in 1895, has undoubtedly been greatly accelerated as a result of the administrative and financial chaos of the revolution and the utter demoralisation which has since been displayed by every department of the public service. Three months ago, looking to the many and great dangers which threatened the nation, it seemed as if, humanly speaking, nothing could save China from her imminent fate of bankruptcy and partition. To-day, it would appear as if that fate had been suspended, and the dangers from without sensibly diminished, because of the convulsion of war in Europe.

The eventual extinction of the German menace in the Western world, as a result of the present titanic struggle, is certain to react immediately upon the balance of power, and to affect the several policies of the nations, throughout the Far East and all the region of the Pacific. The understanding lately recorded between Great Britain and Japan, in regard to the eventual restoration of Kiao-chao to China, affords a significant indication of the probable direction of impending changes and, incidentally, of their effect upon the destinies of the Chinese people. The significance of that understanding is emphasised by the emergence of the United States, not only as a world-Power, but as the exponent of a moral force in politics, directly and consciously concerned in the maintenance of the *status quo* in the Far East, and in the preservation of the integrity of China as defined by the Treaty of Portsmouth and in the preamble to the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of Alliance. Bearing in mind this aspect of the situation, and assuming it to be impossible that Germany should hereafter be able to exact compensation from China (as she has threatened to do) for the attack on Kiao-chao, we are justified in believing that, upon the restoration of that ' leased 'territory' to the Chinese Government's control, there must follow either an abandonment or a radical modification of the

' spheres-of-influence ' policy by Great Britain and France, and that the American Government will henceforth be associated with their policy in China. Accomplished facts will, no doubt, be recognised in Manchuria and Mongolia, and the situation regularised which has conferred upon Russia and Japan ' special rights and interests ' in those regions ; but the process of geographical gravitation will need to be definitely arrested, by common consent, at the Great Wall. Furthermore, since the commercial Powers can claim their own special rights and interests in the restoration of financial stability and in the development of trade in China, it may also reasonably be assumed that, in any general settlement of the Chinese question, an international mandate will be conferred upon those which are best qualified to direct the necessary work of reorganisation.

Even had there been no outbreak of war in Europe, even if cosmopolitan finance (skilfully engineered from Brussels and Berlin) had continued to sap the last remnants of China's financial stability and to peg out the prospective claims of her residuary legatees in the shape of concessions, sooner or later the political instinct of the Anglo-Saxon race on both shores of the Atlantic and at the Antipodes must have awakened to the fact that, with the completion of the Panama Canal, the world's geographical centre of gravity has been shifted from the Mediterranean to the Caribbean Sea. For some years past the future of China has become a matter of paramount importance to the balance of power in the Pacific.

That British and American statesmen have recognised the increasing necessity of protecting China against aggression from without and disruption from within is clearly proved by the diplomatic record of both countries. Ever since 1898, when Germany, by compelling China to ' lease ' the harbour and territory of Kiao-chao, inaugurated the policy of ' spheres ' of influence ' and its corollary of conquest by railway and bank, the policy of Great Britain and that of the United States have been alike directed towards assisting China on the path of administrative reform, and preventing further encroachments on her territory. The ' open door ' agreements initiated in 1902 by Mr. Secretary Hay, the Portsmouth Treaty concluded in 1905 under the auspices of Mr. Roosevelt, and Mr. Secretary Knox's well-meant, but disastrous, attempt in 1909,

to secure the neutralisation of the Manchurian railways,—in fact, all the political activities of the United States in the Far East since the end of the nineteenth century, have held in view the same aim as that which England proclaimed in the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, namely, to ensure 'the independ-'ence and integrity of the Chinese Empire, and the principle 'of equal opportunities for the commerce and industry of all 'nations in China.' But in spite of the intelligent anticipation displayed by statesmen like Mr. Seward, Mr. Roosevelt, and Mr. Root, the part played by America in China since the Boxer rising (1900) has been characterised more by a general profession of benevolent sentiments than by measures of practical utility. Her policy has consistently reflected the high moral principles and humanitarian sentiments of the Administration at Washington and its enthusiasm for Arbitration Treaties and pacificism, rather than a clear perception of the disintegrating forces at work. Even its 'shirt-sleeve' diplomacy, displayed for a brief period at Peking in 1909, was never a matter of conviction; always, behind the instinctive recognition of America's future interests in the Pacific, and misgivings on the subject of the nation's attitude in the matter of Asiatic immigration, there have lurked sentimental ideas as to China's prospects of efficient self-government, born of a general misconception of the real situation; and behind these again, the apathy of the commercial community towards a market which has failed to fulfil its expectations. Therefore, whilst sincerely in sympathy with the avowed objects of Great Britain in China, the assertion by the United States of the 'open door' policy has proved utterly ineffective to restrain the ambitions of territorial expansion manifested, first by Russia, then by Japan, and finally by both powers together on China's northern frontiers.

England's first Treaty of Alliance with Japan, concluded in January 1902, undoubtedly served to check for the time being the advance of Russia through Manchuria into Northern and Central China. It afforded the Manchus a breathing space and a last opportunity of setting their house in order, of reorganising their military and economic resources. But that opportunity was lost, and when, as the result of Mr. Knox's pathetic efforts to secure adherence to the terms of

the Portsmouth Treaty, Russia and Japan concluded their mutually defensive agreement in July 1910, Great Britain was no longer in a position to co-operate effectively for the maintenance of Treaty rights, or to protect China from the consequences of her rapidly increasing demoralisation. When the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was renewed in August 1905, simultaneously with the conclusion of the Portsmouth Treaty, it had already become evident to every practical statesman that no such instrument could serve to restrain Japan's imperative needs and national instincts of expansion. As a matter of fact, the renewal of the Alliance actually helped Japan to assert a preponderant influence in China, as Great Britain's energies and attention became more and more directed towards the menace of Germany's naval preparations in the North Sea. As far as its essential clauses were concerned (those which guaranteed China in the unimpaired enjoyment of her sovereign rights in Manchuria), the Portsmouth Treaty had been to all intents and purposes a dead letter from the moment of its signature. It was openly ignored by both its signatories on the day (4th July 1910) when they concluded the Russo-Japanese agreement. Both were well aware by this time that Great Britain, harassed by internal dissensions and compelled to stand on her guard in Europe, could not afford to oppose either Russian or Japanese encroachments upon Chinese territory, lest either or both of these Powers might be drawn into the orbit of German influence. Upon the withdrawal of the British squadrons from the China Sea, the efforts of British diplomacy at Peking, during and after the revolution of 1911, were of necessity confined to the protection of trade interests, and to giving the Chinese Government financial support in the hope of restoring its greatly weakened authority over the provinces.

Under these conditions, it was inevitable that the 'spheres 'of influence' régime should gradually be re-established. That régime was more or less sincerely renounced and abandoned in 1905 by all the Powers. (Germany, it is true, merely signified, on a scrap of paper, her theoretical acceptance of the 'open door,' whilst continuing to violate it in practice.) The Battle of Concessions (1898) was succeeded, after the Russo-Japanese war, by a period of international railway agreements and cosmopolitan financial activities entrusted to the Six-

Powers group of State-supported banks at Peking. But upon England's definite acquiescence in the claims of Russia and Japan to 'special rights and interests' in Manchuria and Mongolia (1912), the principle of equal opportunities became *ipso facto* suspended, and the subsequent dissolution of the financial *consortium* (September 1913) was the signal for a new and fierce scramble for loans and concessions, together with the assertion of the old spheres of influence on new lines. British diplomacy, *faute de mieux*, and in the hope of saving something from the wreck, was constrained, at the beginning of this year, to follow the multitude to do evil. Even the United States Government, which, after the collapse of the Manchurian neutralisation scheme and the appearance of Mr. Wilson at the White House, had retired with wounded feelings from the field of international finance, has now entered the lists again and is once more interested in the scramble for concessions at Peking. It has recently supported the Standard Oil Company, the Bethlehem Steel Corporation, and other powerful organs of American industry, in securing a share of reversionary claims to the Sick Man's estate.

At the end of last year, everything justified the conclusion that the independence of China could not much longer be maintained against the elements of disintegration. But more than once, when things have seemed desperate, the stars in their courses have fought to preserve the world's oldest civilisation from dismemberment, and once again it would seem as if China were destined to enjoy a respite from encroachments on her sovereign rights and a final period of grace in which to put in hand the work of national reorganisation. For it must be evident that, upon the conclusion of the present war in Europe, upon England's being relieved from the pressing menace of the German fleet, the question of the integrity of China must assume a new importance in world politics. For England, and for America, this question must pass from the region of pious aspirations to that of urgent actualities; both countries will of necessity be compelled to revise their respective policies, recognising not only the far-reaching changes brought about by this war in the general balance of power on the Pacific, but the actual helplessness and political inefficiency of the Chinese Government. These things being recognised, there must henceforward be a truce to the sentimentalism which professes

belief in a new era, to be brought about by Young China's declaration of Republican principles ; a truce to the benevolent idealism, which has hitherto refused to see in the incorrigible corruption of China's official class the chief cause of her national weakness. The problem of the immediate future is twofold : to save China from external aggression and from internal demoralisation. Clearly, the path of salvation will not be quickly found, nor easily followed : yet it must needs be sought, if civilisation would preserve China as a nation and save her people from grievous afflictions.

Before proceeding to consider the probable international aspects of the new situation which must arise in the Far East upon the conclusion of peace in Europe, it is desirable that the reader should clearly realise how greatly China stands in need of salvation. To this end, it is necessary to review, as briefly as may be, the main facts of the situation, as revealed in the struggle for loans and concessions at Peking at the beginning of the present year, and in the rapid development of the several schemes of peaceful penetration which have been set in operation by the competing Powers.

First, as regards the Chinese Government itself. All pretence of observing even the outward forms of Republicanism or representative government has gradually been abandoned by common consent, as Yuan Shih-k'ai at Peking, and his lieutenants at the provincial capitals, have bought or fought their way to undisputed authority. In April the provisional Constitution of the Republic (of which the people had never even heard) was abolished by a stroke of the Presidential pen, and the President invested with supreme command of the Army, the Navy, and the national finances. A Privy Council was inaugurated which, like the Cabinet, holds office at the President's pleasure. China has, in fact, reverted to autocratic government, the only kind of government, be it admitted, by which some sort of law and order can be evolved from the existing chaos. Yuan Shih-k'ai's selection of officials for high office has followed the traditional lines of Chinese statecraft, and gives evidence of the same astute knowledge of men and affairs which he displayed, under the Empress Dowager, as Viceroy of Chihli. *Divide et impera* was ever its fundamental principle, the loyalty of his immediate supporters being cultivated by a judicious combination of firmness and liberality.

The irreconcilable element of Young China, the turbulent student and journalist class, has been ruthlessly removed from office, and its predatory activities kept in check by something approaching to methods of terrorism. The classically conservative order of mandarin has been restored to power, most of those selected for responsible posts being men who had attained to distinction or wealth under the Monarchy. As for Yuan himself, the first object of his policy has been clearly manifested ; all his energies and those of his representatives in the provinces have been directed towards the re-establishment of the Central Government's authority, and of the fiscal machinery necessary to produce regular remittances from the provinces to Peking. Realising the imminent danger which must confront the country in the event of the Government being unable to bear the ever-increasing burden of its foreign obligations, all his efforts have been concentrated upon devising ways and means of meeting debts as they fall due, pending the restoration of revenue-producing trade and the systematic reorganisation of taxation. For the rest, until the financial situation can be relieved, the Government's foreign policy remains one of hand-to-mouth expedients and fatalistic acceptance of the inevitable.

But all Yuan Shih-k'ai's intelligence and courage have not been able to supply the one thing needful to make his policy permanently successful, to wit, honest men to carry it out. The new Finance Departments, created under his direct control, have become as notorious for corruption as anything that existed under the last of the Manchus. His own confidential Secretary, the Cantonese Liang Shih-yi (greatly distinguished for ' slimness ' at the Board of Communications in former days), has become, since the Revolution, the centre of a network of intrigue and wholesale ' squeezing,' whose evil influence extends all over the country. This typical mandarin proceeded, after Yuan Shih-k'ai's elevation to the Presidency, to fill the Peking Government offices and provincial posts with henchmen of his own. Thereupon, the old provincial factions broke out as of old, Hunan arrayed against Anhui and both against Canton, in a grim, silent struggle for place and pelf and power. The nation's dangers have been lost to sight ; hardly a voice during the last year has been raised, either by Young China or Old, to stem the tide of frenzied

finance which has naturally resulted from these rivalries. Just as, at the height of the Revolution, everything turned upon the question whether Yuan Shih-k'ai and the Monarchists, or Sun Yat-sen and the Republicans, would be able first to secure a foreign loan, so it has been again. With China visibly nearing the brink of national bankruptcy, the attention of metropolitan and provincial officials alike has been absorbed in the struggle between the factions of Liang Shih-yi and Liang T'un-yen, a fierce feud in which all sense of the country's parlous state has been submerged in a welter of self-seeking greed. Ten just men, ten upright and able leaders of public opinion, might have saved the situation; but neither Old China nor Young could produce them. Yuan has done his best to check the demoralisation of his subordinates and to prevent them from concluding the irregular and ruinous loan agreements to which irresponsible foreign financiers have invited them; but in vain. He himself has not been in a position to discountenance lavish borrowing. Money must be forthcoming for his troops, for purchases of 'loyalty' in disaffected regions, and for administrative expenses; but at least he has realised the danger of loans independently contracted by the provincial authorities, and of those even more suicidal 'industrial' and armament agreements, by which the borrowing official has saddled the country with totally unnecessary liabilities in his blind haste to secure something, anything, in ready cash. Between January and June of this year most of the members of the Cabinet, including Yuan himself, have been impeached for corruption by the Censors, at the instigation of one or other of the contending factions. Three Ministers, two ex-Ministers, and several provincial Tutuhs, publicly charged with serious malversation of funds, were to have been brought before the Administrative Court for trial, but no trial has taken place, because the accused threatened to make public the details of several loan transactions with foreigners, which might well have involved the Government in serious difficulties. Only one high official, the Governor of the Metropolitan Prefecture, has been removed from office for flagrant bribery and corruption. Referring to his case, the Peking correspondent of the 'Morning Post' (whose despatches during the past year have shown remarkable knowledge of the situation) observed that the Government must be held largely to blame

for the dishonesty prevalent amongst officials, 'because, in 'its anxiety to obtain revenues from the country, it has 'increased existing taxes and imposed new ones, promising 'decorations and commissions to those officials who make the 'handsomest returns. And tenure of office is at present so 'insecure that many officials act upon the principle of making 'hay whilst the sun shines.' In other words, the traditional dishonesty of the mandarin class, the root-cause of China's political weakness under the Manchus, has been in no way diminished, but rather increased, by reason of the Government's increasing financial necessities.

Such being the state of affairs at Peking, it is evident that a return to the 'spheres of influence' policy by the Foreign Powers was bound to accelerate the demoralisation of the mandarins, and to lead to the mortgaging of every realisable security of which the metropolitan and provincial officials could dispose. A glance at the 'Report of the Short-Term 'Debts of the Central Government,' issued by the Ministry of Finance towards the end of last year, gives an idea—rough and admittedly incomplete—of the manner in which the several Ministries at Peking have been permitted to raise funds, each on its own account, and this in spite of the advances made for 'administrative expenses' to the Central Government by the Quintuple Group on 'Reorganisation Loan' account, the Belgian and Birch-Crisp loans, and other considerable receipts. Examination of this extremely interesting and instructive report shows internal short-term debts, incurred by six Ministries, amounting to over forty-seven millions of dollars, most of which are due to native banks and Government contractors. Under the heading of foreign short-term debts, for which the Government is responsible, the total is twenty-nine millions of dollars, represented chiefly by loans, at interest varying between six and thirteen per cent., from Japanese, Belgian, Russian, and German financiers and armament firms. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, for instance, records its obligations to the Russo-Asiatic Bank, the Banque Sino-Belge, and to Messrs. J. P. Morgan & Co.; the advances made by the last-named bankers are secured upon the portion of the Boxer indemnity which was remitted by the U.S. Government in 1908, and officially ear-marked for the education of Chinese students in America! The Ministry of Education records several loans

advanced by the Banque Sino-Belge to meet the needs of students in England, France, and Belgium, one of these being secured upon the buildings of the Peking University. And so on, throughout a long list of obligations of every sort, comparatively unimportant in their amounts, but by their nature and conditions most eloquent of the hopeless condition of China's finances.

More significant even than the details of these short-term debts is the fact that the Ministry of Finance makes no attempt to compile a similar list of 'minor and provincial loans.' Yet the number of these is known to be large, and many of them have been concluded with foreign firms under conditions which, sooner or later, must add seriously to the embarrassments of the Central Government. One typical case of provincial money-raising has been brought to light in a document recently drawn up and circulated by Hsiung Hsi-ling, ex-Premier and Minister of Finance, in which he defends himself against the charges of corruption which have been brought against him in the native press. It shows that last year the Government, in compliance with an urgent request for funds from the provincial authorities of Kiangsu, handed them five million dollars' worth of eight per cent. National bonds 'to be disposed of at the best price obtainable for the 'payment of troops and to meet obligations on former foreign 'loans.' Of these five millions $300,000 were actually used for military purposes, $200,000 were handed to the notorious revolutionary agitator Chen Chi-mei, and the rest was devoted to purposes of which no account has ever been rendered. The interesting feature of this transaction lies in the fact that the entire bond issue has been mortgaged to a German firm (Siemens & Co.), who paid for them at the rate of $65 for every $100 bond. In other words, while the Central Government has been officially borrowing from the Quintuple group at five per cent., under conditions which involve something approaching regular supervision of expenditure, it has been simultaneously and systematically allowing the country's credit to be pledged, at ruinous rates, in these unofficial and irregular transactions. Such instances might be multiplied almost indefinitely. In many cases, loans which have given the borrowing officials a small accommodation in cash have pledged the Government to purchase from the

lenders utterly superflous consignments of arms or machinery. The Austrian ' torpedo boats ' loan (April 1913) was a particularly flagrant example of this suicidal form of finance.

The position of affairs thus revealed becomes emphasised when we come to examine the wider field of railway and mining concessions negotiated by the Chinese Government with the several Powers, or their financial agents, within their respective ' spheres of influence.' In this direction, the activities of the Powers point, as clearly as they did in 1898, to a general recognition of China's insolvency and helplessness on the one hand, and to well-defined political schemes on the other. France, loyally co-operating to finance and promote the ambitious designs of Russian political strategy, has now become diplomatically identified with Belgium (as in the case of the Hankow-Canton line in 1898) in negotiations for a trunk railway from a small port on the lower Yangtsze to Lanchowfu, a line intended to connect at some future date with the projected Russian railway to Lanchowfu through Chinese Turkestan. At the same time, the French Banque Industrielle has obtained a concession to build a line from Yamchow, near Pakhoi, through Nanning and Sing Yi-fu to Yünnanfu, and thence to Chungking, a total length of over 1000 miles. The preliminary agreement for this concession carries a clause by virtue of which, on completion of the final agreement, the Chinese Government is to receive a large sum in cash for ' administrative expenses.' At the date of its signature (January 1914), the French Minister at Peking was engaged in negotiations to obtain the sole rights of railway construction between Yünnanfu and Chengtu. As ' The Times ' correspondent at Peking justly observed in reporting this matter :

> ' Significance attaches to this scheme, because it involves the linking up of the French Yünnan railway with the other great Belgian project from Chengtu to Tatung-fu, for which a concession was lately obtained. The Belgian scheme is really mainly French, and, it is suspected, partly Russian, and will inevitably connect hereafter with the Russian Trans-Mongolian railway in the north, thereby creating another tremendous steel road, based on Russian territory and politically Russian throughout its length.'

At this juncture, whilst thus encroaching on the British railway sphere of the Yangtsze valley, the French Government

evidently assumed that Great Britain's apparent indifference to the course of events in the Far East would lead her to acquiesce in the establishment of exclusive French railway and mining rights in Yünnan and Szechuan, and this notwithstanding the Salisbury-Cambon convention of 1896, by which the equal and mutual rights of both countries were determined. But in this matter the Quai d'Orsay was mistaken, for the British and Indian Governments proved to be fully alive to the necessity of preserving their Treaty rights and full liberty of action, especially in regard to the linking up with the Burmese frontier of the proposed British railway from Yünnanfu to Talifu. French diplomacy found consolation for this disappointment in the recognition by the Quintuple Banks of French rights to the construction of the extension of the Hankow-Szechuan railway from Kueichowfu to Chengtu, via Chungking. As the result of all these activities, two French railways will in course of time converge on Yünnanfu from the coast, to be continued thence, by a single line, into Szechuan. A position of predominance for French interests in south-western China is thus assured, which, if the 'spheres of 'influence' policy should be maintained, would, no doubt, enable France to monopolise the construction of branch lines north and south of the Upper Yangtsze, over a considerable portion of the region originally defined as the British sphere. There may be doubts whether the French and Belgian railway systems are definitely intended to serve the ultimate purposes of Franco-Russian political designs on Chinese territory, in the same way as they were certainly intended to do during the period which ended with the Boxer rising, Russia's refusal to evacuate Manchuria and her consequent war with Japan. Russia's policy in China can no longer cherish dreams of a Far Eastern Empire such as those which ended with the fall of Port Arthur; her expansion eastwards and south in future must always reckon with the strategical and political necessities of a powerful neighbour. But whatever may be the ultimate object which French policy has in view, the incontestable fact remains —a fact of vital importance to Great Britain's position as an Asiatic Power—that the last three years have witnessed the steady development of a wide sphere of French influence in south-western China which, under existing conditions, bids fair to become exclusive. The rapidity with which this

process of peaceful penetration has advanced may be ascribed partly to Great Britain's absorption in problems nearer home, and partly to the increasing demoralisation of the Chinese authorities. Whereas, in 1898,* railway concessions involving political advantages were only to be extracted from the reluctant Chinese Government by severe diplomatic pressure, frequently emphasised by demonstrations of naval and military force, during the past three years they have been secured with increasing ease and frequency by any bagman-diplomat, or financial agent, able to dispose of comparative trifling amounts of ' bargain-money ' in ready cash.

The activities displayed by French and Belgian concessionaires in central and western China have been fairly matched by those of Germany, both in the region of political finance at Peking and in her exclusive sphere of influence in and about the province of Shantung. By an agreement signed in December last at Peking, and amplified as to its provisions in June of this year, Germany secured important rights of extension for the Shantung railway system, strengthening her hold at the same time on the northern section of the Tientsin-Pukou trunk line, and thence extending German influence westwards to the Peking-Hankow trunk line and in other directions far beyond the limits claimed under the Kiao-chao Convention.

Japan, hampered by lack of capital from undertaking the financing and construction of Chinese railway schemes in competition with European financiers; fully engaged, moreover, in the consolidation and extension of her ' special rights and ' interests ' in Manchuria and Inner Mongolia, has displayed activities in the scramble for concessions which, on the surface, may appear less conspicuous than those of Belgium and France; but they have been none the less far-reaching and important. The policy adopted by Japanese financial and industrial agents, backed by a scientifically-organised Intelligence Department, has chiefly been directed towards establishing influence over Chinese officials, many of whom, at Peking and in the provinces, have been placed under pecuniary obligations to the Yokohama Specie Bank,

* *Vide* Sir Claude Macdonald's despatches to Lord Salisbury in Blue Book, No. 1 (China) of 1899.

the Mitsui Company, and other ostensibly commercial institutions. Thus, during and after the revolution of 1911, important Japanese interests were created and consolidated (notably in the case of the Han Yeh-p'ing iron and coal mines on the Yangtsze valley) by means of comparatively small loans to the provincial government at Nanking. Sun Yat-sen's revolutionary forces were largely financed and armed from Japan; the relations thus established materialised at Tokyo in 1912, in the form of a Sino-Japanese Industrial Development Corporation, which, had Young China remained in power, would assuredly have enjoyed a wide field of special opportunities and privileges. Young China's authority has now been superseded, but the Sino-Japanese Corporation has nevertheless survived, and under the able direction of Baron Shibusawa has recently displayed great activity. The Japanese Government, it is true, has officially denied that Baron Shibusawa's recent mission to China was in any way connected with concessions, more particularly in the Yangtsze valley. In this connexion, however, it may be remembered that precisely similar assurances were given in 1908, when British railway enterprise in that region was nevertheless effectively hampered by certain relations which the Yokohama Specie Bank had established by means of loans to the Viceroy Chang Chih-tung. The only railway concession openly sought by Japan this year is a line from Foochow, through Kiangsi and Hunan, to Kiukiang on the Yangtsze.

Confronted by all these ominous activities of Russian, French, German, and Japanese concessionaires, and by their rapid creation of financial and industrial interests, obviously intended to constitute political claims in a final débâcle, it became impossible for the British Government to maintain its profession of faith in the 'open door' fiction, or to shut its eyes to the increasing dangers of the situation. As a matter of fact, the Foreign Office and all close observers of events were well aware four years ago, when Russia and Japan first vetoed the construction of the Anglo-American Chinchou-Aigun railway, that the 'open door' had ceased to exist as practical politics, that the chief object of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was no longer obtainable by virtue of that instrument, and that the Portsmouth Treaty had become, to all intents and purposes, obsolete. But British policy in China was not unaccustomed

to drift on backwaters of expediency, and it was clearly out of the question to fight single-handed for China's sovereign rights. After all, British trade in China was comparatively insignificant, and for its sake to endanger the solidity of the Triple Entente was a game that certainly could not be worth the candle. But when the scramble for concessions at Peking began to assume a form and direction which threatened not only the principle of equal opportunities but Great Britain's strategical position in western China and her trade routes of the future with India, it became clear that something more than pious aspirations must be invoked to arrest this process of peaceful penetration. The British Government therefore, though with obvious reluctance, reverted to the 'sphere of 'influence' policy. In the beginning of this year, it brought pressure to bear at Peking, as the result of which China has re-affirmed the predominance of Great Britain in the Yangtsze Valley; at the same time, it was agreed that no new railway concessions, other than British, shall hereafter be granted in the Yangtsze provinces below Hankow.

The situation was admittedly difficult. From the diplomatic point of view, there was nothing to be lost, and possibly something to be gained, by a display of energy at this juncture. But as a matter of permanent utility, any attempt to assert an effective sphere of British influence can never be anything more than a 'face-saving' expedient at best. Our claims in that direction were definitely abandoned when, in 1900, the military forces of Germany, Japan, and other Powers were permitted to 'protect' Shanghai. The abandonment of our privileged position and special interests in the Yangtsze was further emphasised when, in 1908, Germany successfully asserted her claim (in the face of a formal protest to the Chinese Government by the British Minister at Peking) to participate in the financing of what until then had been claimed as British railway concessions. That lamentable fiasco, primarily due to the close relations established by Berlin financiers with Lombard Street, could only be defended on the assumption that spheres of influence had been definitely abandoned; nevertheless, Germany gave no sign of surrendering her exclusive position in Shantung, and Japan was visibly tightening her hold upon Manchuria. Since that date, as I have shown, France, Belgium, Germany, and Japan have all proceeded to

establish important interests in the Yangtsze Valley, their objects being quite as much political as commercial.

Only the difficulties of England's position, reflected in the withdrawal of the British squadron from the Far East, could explain her tacit abandonment of the doctrine of 'equal 'opportunities for the commerce and industry of all nations.' That doctrine had been repeatedly proclaimed as essential to the maintenance of the independence and integrity of China, and as such it had been formally accepted by all the Powers in numerous Treaties and Conventions. From the British and American points of view, aiming only at the preservation of a potentially valuable market, and opposed to territorial expansion at the expense of a helpless nation, the only consistent policy was to insist on regarding all China as a common sphere of equal influence. Admitting even that the aggressive action of Germany and the *entente* between Russia and Japan had made this impracticable, the re-assertion of a British sphere in the Yangtsze might serve, for the time being, to prevent the encroachment of non-British railway enterprises on our western trade outlets from that region ; but no diplomatic fiction could ever make that sphere permanently effective. That birthright was irrevocably sold, fourteen years before, for a mess of pottage, made in Germany. A return to the spheres-of-influence policy practically amounts to an admission that the independence of China is threatened ; that, as it was in the case of Korea, every additional guarantee of the integrity of her territories only accentuates the danger in which she stands. It amounts also to a confession that sentimentalism is futile in the face of that type of political ascendency which follows conquest by railway and bank. Treaties and Conventions may possess restraining force and value where their existence leads to the formation of a solid world-force of public opinion against wanton aggression ; but where a process of peaceful penetration creates, in undeveloped regions, special rights and interests which tend to assume a political complexion, the conscience of the civilised world is generally prepared to acquiesce in their results, just as it accepts the results of conquest by war. There is a clearly marked tendency to acquiesce when these results are due to physical and moral inefficiency on the one hand, and to vigorous national impulses of expansion on the other. The attitude

of the civilised world towards Japanese expansion in the thinly populated regions of Manchuria, Mongolia, and Korea affords an example of this consensus of opinion, as instructive in its way as the situation brought about in Mexico by the refusal of America's political idealists to recognise the actualities of the conditions existing in that country. But there can be no room for any nation's expansion into the thickly inhabited regions of China proper, nor any justification for the exploiting of her defenceless people ; and in so much as the spheres-of-influence policy must be held to foreshadow the partition of the country, its adoption by Great Britain, even as a matter of temporary expediency, is futile and undignified. It is futile, because, if carried to its logical conclusions, it must involve, sooner or later, the establishment of a British Protectorate in the Yangtsze Valley, a result which public opinion in England would never tolerate. It is undignified, because it stultifies all the avowed principles of British policy in the Far East and tacitly sanctions a general repudiation of pledges solemnly exchanged between all the Powers concerned.

But it is surely reasonable to hope and believe that, upon the conclusion of peace in Europe, when the civilised world shall have been relieved of the menace of German militarism and England's fleets be free once more to show the flag in all the Seven Seas, the attitude of the pacifically disposed commercial nations must be seriously directed towards creating a better state of affairs in China. The collective authority of Europe, which from motives of justice and expediency has been able to protect the neutrality of States like Belgium, Holland, and Switzerland, should surely be able to guarantee the integrity of China and at the same time to devise some practical measures for the necessary reform of her administration and finances.

Once more, at the conclusion of this war, China will stand at the parting of the ways. Once more the Powers concerned in the preservation of her ancient state, and in the development of her trade and economic resources, will have an opportunity of devising measures to that end. There is reason for the belief that many of the activities and rivalries, which have produced a revival of the spheres-of-influence policy, represent the ambitions and proclivities of agents and advisers on the spot rather than the definite aims of their respective governments ; also that the collective conscience of the civilised

world desires to see China maintained as an independent nation, under a stable and well-ordered government. If this be so, it should be possible for the delegates of the Powers, when they come together to determine the conditions of peace in Europe, to include in the final settlement a convention in regard to the future of China. General assurances, of the kind recorded in Mr. Secretary Hay's 'open door' exchange of Notes, have failed to carry any protective force. Treaties between individual Powers—such as the Treaty of Portsmouth—have proved equally ineffective. What is required is a comprehensive international convention, by virtue of which all the Treaty Powers would be mutually and respectively bound to abstain from all acts of territorial aggression against China, to abandon within her frontiers all claims to rights and interests that are not common to all, and to submit to an independent Arbitration Tribunal all financial or other differences that may from time to time arise between them and the Government of China. The claims of humanity towards the sorely oppressed Chinese people, the interests of the world's commerce, the cause of peace and the credit of civilisation, all stand to gain so greatly from the conclusion of such an international agreement that neither philanthropists nor statesmen can afford to let the opportunity be lost which will present itself at the conclusion of the war in Europe.

To some, the idea of such an agreement may seem a counsel of perfection. Yet, if we believe that the end of this war must witness a world-wide reaction against the doctrines of aggressive militarism, an international guarantee of the integrity of China should present no insuperable difficulty. Given good faith and good will, the thing can be done. But to guarantee the integrity of China, without taking steps to ensure a radical reform of the country's administration and finances, would in no wise secure the permanent well-being of the Chinese people. Simultaneous steps must therefore be taken to induce, and, if necessary, to compel, the Chinese Government to set its house in order.

As regards reconciling the existing rights and interests of the several Powers, the special position claimed by Russia and Japan in Manchuria and Mongolia, having been recognised by the Powers and by China herself, would necessarily require to be included in the *status quo*; but its geographical limits would

require to be more closely defined. The autonomy claimed by Mongolia and Tibet makes the acceptance of accomplished facts in those regions easier, so far as the *amour-propre* of the Chinese is concerned. But for the rest, with the passing of the German sphere of influence in Shantung, it would be a timely act of magnanimity, and a pledge of goodwill, if Great Britain were to restore the harbour and leased territory of Weihaiwei to China. In the matter of railway concessions definitely completed, where these relate to undertakings not under the control of China, formal guarantees should be given, by the Powers concerned, that no differential tariffs will ever be imposed thereon, nor any privileges claimed, to the detriment of traders of other nations or of China's sovereign rights. The invidious position of affairs created by the imposition of differential rates in favour of Japanese shippers on the South Manchurian railway points to the necessity for a clear understanding on this point.

As the allies of Russia and Japan, France and England respectively should be in a position to make an effective appeal to these Powers and to restrain them in future from encroachments upon Chinese territory. Both will have sufficient occupation for many years to come in developing the economic and mineral resources of Manchuria and Mongolia; moreover both will need the help of British and French capital for that purpose. And, what is even more essential to the satisfactory adjustment of international complications in China, neither of these powerful neighbours of hers, destined henceforth to watch each other closely on contiguous frontiers, can afford to antagonise a strong force of public opinion in Europe and America.

One of the most hopeful auguries for the future lies in the unmistakable awakening of public opinion in the United States to a sense of national responsibility in regard to the outside world and its affairs. As the American Press indicates, it is not only that Americans have been led to see that their own trade and industries are intimately bound up with those of Europe; they have realised that America cannot aspire to be a world-Power, worthily to play her predestined part in the counsels of the nations, by adherence to the old time-worn doctrines of lofty detachment and self-sufficient isolation. For good or evil, from the day that she set her outposts on the

Pacific, America assumed her share in the White Man's burden, and the truth has now been brought home to the American people. 'The time has come,' as President Wilson said on September 6, 'for great things. These are days big with 'destiny for the United States.' The world's responsibilities henceforward are theirs also, and since they must launch out upon those perilous seas, they must needs be drawn into closer relations with the great democracies of England and France, because the ideals of those democracies stand for personal freedom, for representative institutions and honest diplomacy. As Admiral Mahan has conclusively shown, the completion of the Panama Canal is bound to produce an immense strengthening of Anglo-Saxon institutions along the north-eastern shores of the Pacific ; it is certain also to necessitate a definite settlement of the question of Asiatic immigration and a corresponding re-adjustment of the Monroe doctrine. The vague and intangible principles of that doctrine are bound to be replaced by something more consistent with an enlightened national policy. Benevolent ideanism must also be tempered by recognition of the necessity for co-operation with friendly Powers in the international political work of the civilised world. The war against German militarism in Europe has hastened the remarkable awakening of public opinion in America, which the Panama Canal had begun. It is bound in the near future to produce a consistent world-policy, emphasised by a fleet capable of protecting American interests in the Atlantic and the Pacific.

American sympathy for the well-being of China has been unmistakably displayed in the past. No opportunity has been neglected to advocate humanitarian principles and justice towards the Chinese people ; but because of the absence of intelligent anticipation, because America's untrained diplomacy at Peking has been animated more by sentimental ideals than by accurate knowledge, the results have been disappointing for Americans and generally unfortunate for the Chinese. There has been, for instance, much vague sympathy for Young China's professions of Republicanism, but no constructive effort to guide and strengthen the hands of China's rulers in the matter of practical reform. The well-meant activities of American Missions and educational bodies, based on the theory that China is fit for self-government and democratic institutions,

have undoubtedly contributed to increase the nation's demoralisation of unrest ; at the same time, the effect of the wide-spread corruption of the official class, as a factor of national weakness, has been uniformly minimised. But the errors of the past are now being generally recognised, and it appears reasonable to predict that America's future policy in the Far East will be based on a clearer perception of the duties and dangers to be faced in that region, and will become more closely identified with that of Great Britain and France, for the protection of common commercial interests and for the preservation of China's national independence.

But the conclusion of a satisfactory international agreement to safeguard China from the perils which threaten her from without can serve no purpose of permanent utility unless it be accompanied by measures, internationally devised, to protect her from the more insidious dangers that threaten her from within. Unless effective steps can be taken to ensure financial, educational and administrative reforms, the very sense of security from attack, which an international guarantee would confer on the Chinese Government, might tend to increase the helpless inefficiency of the mandarin class. Here, again, proposals to introduce radical reforms may be regarded by some as counsels of perfection ; nevertheless, if only the Powers can be led to concur as to their necessity, the difficulties in the way of their execution should not be unsurmountable. But no half-measures, which merely strike at surface evils without touching the root of China's troubles, can avail anything. Currency reform, lekin abolition, increased tariffs, the remission of indemnities, reorganisation loans, and all such expedients, can be of no permanent value unless and until the whole system of Government revenue and expenditure has been thoroughly reorganised, on a system of strict auditing, by fully trained and responsible accountants. The Imperial Maritime Customs Collectorate has fully proved during the past fifty years that such a system can be introduced without detriment to China's sovereign rights and with the best results ; more important still, its record has shown that, given reasonable salaries and good discipline, Chinese officials in subordinate positions can be trained to perform their duties honestly and efficiently. Every mandarin in China is well aware that if the country is still solvent, the fact is entirely due to the regularly collected

revenues of the Imperial Maritime Customs; nevertheless because that system of strict accounts leaves no opportunity for 'squeezing,' all the energies of the official class have fiercely opposed its extension for the past twenty years. Sentimental observers, attributing this attitude to instincts of patriotism, have given it their sympathy and support; so much so that, in 1907, the British Government, against the express advice of its Minister at Peking, was induced to abandon the regular accountancy clause in the agreements for railways built with British capital—with deplorable results. Since then, spasmodic and irresolute attempts have been made to apply a system of foreign-controlled auditing to the expenditure of loans, and expert supervision, in the person of Sir Richard Dane, has been applied to the surface workings of the Salt Gabelle. But, to be effective, the reorganisation of China's finances must be radical. It must assume, during an educative period, a form of authoritative tutelage; it must gently but firmly regulate the business of the mandarin so as to save his 'face' and, at the same time, the public funds.

As matters stand, China is virtually bankrupt. All her realisable assets, and some that are not realisable, have been mortgaged. Her present policy of paying old debts with new loans merely postpones and aggravates the final reckoning. Pending the systematic development of new resources, and the restoration of the old fiscal machinery of the provinces, temporary expedients, such as an increase of the import tariff, may be necessary. But the revenues required hereafter to meet the country's obligations can only be secured by a complete reorganisation of the Civil Service, under expert foreign supervision and a rigid system of book-keeping. As a first step in this direction, the Chinese Government should be required to engage trained auditors and financial experts, with fully defined duties and authority, to supervise the business of the Ministry of Finance and to prepare Budgets based on facts. No new loans, either for the Central Government or for the provinces, should be raised except upon an auditor's approval and for purposes publicly stated. All railways and mines should be worked on a regular system of published accounts, such as that which has produced excellent results in the case of the Imperial Railways of North China. The Lekin and Salt Gabelle Collectorates should be gradually reorganised on

similar lines, with permanent and adequately paid staffs, as in the case of the Customs. All experts engaged would necessarily be employés of the Chinese Government, but their specified duties should be performed, so long as the Collectorates remain pledged for the service of foreign loans, under conditions which would simultaneously protect the interests of the Chinese Government and those of the bondholders. Finally, all expenditure on ships and munitions of war, and on military forces other than those required for maintenance of internal order, should be severely discountenanced; local police forces, properly equipped and paid, should be made a first charge on provincial revenues. The allocation to the provincial authorities of a fixed quota of land-tax, railways, mining, salt and other revenues would require to be strictly defined, under regulations of the Ministry of Finance.

To bring these reforms into operation, pressure would have to be brought to bear at the outset upon the official class, whose vested interests lie in the preservation of the existing disorder; but collective action by the Powers would convince them that desperate diseases require desperate remedies. As for the people at large, all the records of the extra-territorialised foreign settlements at the Treaty Ports and of the 'leased 'territories' (notably that of Wei-hai-wei) go to show that they may be expected to welcome any reforms which would relieve them of irregular exactions and afford reasonable security for life and property. The organisation of a stable and well-ordered Government at Peking, and the restoration of the country to solvency and prosperity, depend, not upon the education of the masses to new ideas, but upon the conversion of the mandarin class from its deep-rooted traditions of inefficiency and dishonesty.

China stands at the parting of the ways. For good or evil, the Powers that represent civilisation must now face the fact and decide whether she shall be allowed to drift, as Persia and Turkey have drifted, down the slope of demoralisation to dismemberment, or whether she shall be assisted to recover her pride of place among the nations. Seldom has a weightier problem confronted humanity.

J. O. P. Bland.

THE WAR

SINCE the last issue of this Review the face of Europe, even of the world, has been changed; whatever the end of the war may be, few things will be quite the same as they were before. The physical cataclysm that has killed or mutilated splendid men in the springtime of life, and reduced to ruins beautiful cities in the pride of age, has had its counterpart in a tremendous upheaval in the thoughts of mankind. The greatest fact is that the world no longer regards as inevitable the dominance of the military power of Germany. For more than forty years that power has hung over Europe like a threatening cloud. Opinions have differed as to the best way of dealing with that power, but all have feared it. Now we see the time approaching when this fear may be dispelled. Europe begins to breathe more freely. Incidentally a good many minor changes have taken place in men's thoughts. In our own country perhaps the most notable change is the temporary abandonment of the spirit of party strife, which seemed as if it were too deeply engrained in the Englishman's nature ever to be removed. No such complete cessation of the battle of parties was witnessed either in the Napoleonic Wars or in the more recent test of the Boer War. In Russia there appears to be an equally striking political revolution. The Poles, so long oppressed, have been promised their freedom; the Jews, spurned and persecuted through centuries, are granted equality with their fellow subjects. In South-Eastern Europe the long-cherished hope of the Slavs to escape from Teutonic or Magyar control seems on the eve of realisation. More generally, there is everywhere a recoil from the hideous doctrine that physical force alone rules in the world, and an awakening to the conception that moral enthusiasm may in the long run be more potent than military organisation, and that justice and freedom are themselves the producers of big battalions.

To take the events of the past few months and their mental reactions in rough historic sequence :—the first point to note

is the sudden realisation by the vast body of Englishmen that war with Germany was, and long had been, inevitable. On this point the present writer must confess that he had misjudged the situation. Till nearly the eve of the outbreak of war it seemed to him that Sir Edward Grey's policy was exaggeratedly anti-German, with the result that we were powerless to arrest Russian aggression. It seemed to him that England could better defend all parts of her Empire, and better contribute to the preservation of the peace of the world, if she were to hold herself free to move in any direction that the needs of the occasion dictated, provided always that she maintained her command of the sea complete and unquestioned. That calculation was sound enough on the assumption that Germany, though bubbling over with ambition, was still willing, like ourselves, to live and let live. It broke down before the fact, now clearly demonstrated, that the main object of Germany's ambition was to destroy England's power. A debt of gratitude is due to those writers who have persistently, for many years past, warned the public of this ever-present German danger; an even greater debt is due to Sir Edward Grey for refusing to permit any secondary considerations to divert him from the course which this danger indicated. If it had been true, as some German apologists have argued, that Germany's greatest pre-occupation was the dread of the overwhelming mass of Slavs on her eastern border, she would have sought a reconciliation with France and cultivated the friendship of England. From time to time she made enough movement in these directions to encourage the hopes of the main body of Englishmen, and to create a fairly widespread feeling that our foreign policy was being deflected from its true course by an anti-German bias. This feeling was strengthened by the repeated occurrence of incidents where England was called upon to use her strength for purposes not her own, or to sacrifice her clear interests for the sake of avoiding offence to her quasi-allies. But events have abundantly proved that Sir Edward Grey was right. He sought friendship where true friendship was possible, in order to be prepared for war where relentless war was certain.

Fortune favouring us, the war came at the most opportune moment for England. The blundering diplomacy of Germany placed us in the position not of seeking, but of giving, help;

it deprived Germany of the aid of the third member of the Triple Alliance, while bringing to the aid of her opponents the armies of Belgium and Serbia, and the sympathy of the greater part of the civilised world. That Germany should have forced a war in such conditions can only be explained on the hypothesis that she allows her foreign policy to be dictated by her soldiers. The soldiers calculated that by hurrying on war they would prevent France from obtaining the advantage of the recently adopted three years' service, and would take her at a moment when her military preparations were confessedly defective in many important details. They further argued that Russia was gaining strength every year and would soon become irresistible ; and they clinched their case by pointing to England's embarrassments in Ireland and the rumours of unrest in Egypt and India. It was an excellent opportunity from the soldier's point of view ; all that was needed in addition was a good *casus belli*. The selection of the quarrel between Austria and Serbia was well conceived, for it was certain that England would be reluctant to take up arms in defence of a country that had outraged civilisation by assassination in the palace and atrocities on the battlefield, and it was probable that Italy would be specially pleased to help in checking the growth of Serb power near the shores of the Adriatic. The game was spoilt by the willingness of Serbia to accept almost any humiliation in preference to war, and by the final eagerness of Russia and Austria to find some form of compromise. Thus the well-chosen *casus belli* vanished, and Germany began war upon both fronts, brutally, cynically, without a shade of excuse.

That in itself was a crime ; others followed quickly. The neutrality of Luxemburg was invaded and a few days later the neutrality of Belgium. The former outrage has not received the attention it deserves. We were equally pledged to defend the neutrality of both countries, but in the case of Luxemburg our Government argued, not for the first time, that the form of the pledge was such that it did not bind us unless our co-signatories also held themselves bound. The plea is unpleasantly suggestive of a legal quibble, and it is to be hoped that no other pledges that England may give will be drawn in language which renders such evasion possible. *Per contra* our failure to pick up the gauntlet thrown down

in Luxemburg is a sufficient proof that Sir Edward Grey was not seeking an excuse for war, as Mr. Ramsay Macdonald has unwarrantably stated. In the case of the attack on Belgium the Government was fortified by the precedent of 1870, and when that attack occurred all shadow of hesitation vanished from the minds of most Englishmen.

The question of our obligation to France, though perhaps even more important from the point of view of our interests than the violation of Belgian neutrality, was not so clear from the point of view of honour. Sir Edward Grey had repeatedly declined to commit himself in advance to support France, and during the crucial days that preceded the war he made it clear that in his view the *entente* with France left England free to decide whether and at what point she would intervene to help her friend. This was certainly the view of the mass of the English people and presumably also of the French people. On any other view we should have been liable to fight in any war, however unjustifiable, in which France chose to engage, even though our interest might be with her enemy ; and she, in turn, in the name of the *entente*, would have been subject to an equally unlimited liability. Sane nations do not commit themselves to such absurdities. There was, however, as an incidental outcome of the *entente*, a naval agreement which left us very little freedom of choice. When the growing menace of the German navy made it desirable for us to deplete our Mediterranean squadron in order to strengthen our fleets in northern waters, France undertook to defend our naval interests in the Mediterranean and we to defend her ports in the Channel. The precise wording of this agreement is of little importance. Its spirit clearly was that our fleet was to be responsible for the work which her fleet could no longer accomplish in the Channel and the Atlantic. In other words, we were bound to defend French shipping, as well as French harbours, not only in the Channel but in the Atlantic as well. We could not, therefore, accept—even if we had trusted her word—Germany's promise to spare French Channel ports if we would remain neutral.

There remained the vital question of our interest in the substantial maintenance of the power of France. On this point the country was all along as nearly as possible unanimous. Everyone understood that England could not afford to see

France utterly crushed, and must sooner or later intervene if it became necessary to save France from German vengeance. It was by many people urged that we ought to intervene at once, for, by holding back, we ran the risk that the Germans might gain such great advantage that it would be extremely difficult to intervene with success at a later stage. This kind of consideration always arises when nations are on the brink of war. The military argument is nearly always in favour of prompt action. From the soldier's point of view, Bret Harte's cynicism is mere common sense :

> 'Blest is the man whose cause is just;
> Thrice blest is he who gets his blow in fust.'

But, as the experience of Germany has already shown, it is dangerous for any nation to rely on military considerations alone. In any case, it is in our country impossible to ignore other considerations which affect the minds of the mass of the people. The British nation cannot be ordered about like a company of soldiers; and if the Government had plunged into war before the mass of the nation was convinced that Germany was in the wrong, the moral and political forces on which our armies and navies ultimately depend would have been immensely weakened. There lies one of the main distinctions between the military despotism that rules the German Empire and the free constitution of the United Kingdom. Our Government cannot take any crucial step unless it is sure of having behind it the general acquiescence of the main body of the people. Necessarily, this involves some delay; and occasions may arise where delay means serious military disadvantage. That is the price we have to pay for our system, but the permanent results we gain are well worth the intermittent payments. There is no Englishman to-day who would exchange his free constitution, with its occasional disadvantages, for the military efficiency of the German Empire.

Nor have we, as events have proved, any reason to be ashamed of the working of our own mechanism for war. In every direction the habitual self-depreciation of Englishmen has given way to a feeling of astonishment at the completeness of the preparations for dealing with the emergency of war, and at the promptitude with which the different branches of the Government have faced unexpected situations.

For us the navy comes always first. Even now it is doubtful whether the general public fully realises all that the navy has done and is doing. It has done immensely more than even the most hopeful dared to dream. We all knew that we had a considerable margin of naval strength, but most people assumed that, in spite of that margin, German cruisers and commerce destroyers would be able to inflict very heavy damage upon our mercantile marine. In particular, it seemed probable that the North Sea would be too dangerous for our merchant ships, and that we should have to rely upon our western and south-western ports for the maintenance of our over-sea trade. These calculations only held good for a very brief space. Within a few days after the beginning of the war, our North Sea ports were declared safe except for the danger of mines; and within a month, the Port of London, so far from suffering from the effects of the war, was more active than in time of peace. The value of this great naval victory, won without firing a shot, is hard to exaggerate. It meant that the Germans were so held down by our naval power that they could not even attempt to capture the rich prizes sailing up and down the sea within a few hours' distance from German naval harbours. It meant more than this. One of the most marvellous facts of the war is the way in which the War Office and the Admiralty between them transported to France three British Army Corps with all their equipment, and have since kept this force of nearly 130,000 men supplied with the necessaries of war, and constantly fed with fresh reinforcements, while the men wounded in battle have been brought back across the Channel to the comfort of hospitals within hail of their own homes. The Germans would have given anything to sink our crowded transports daily crossing the Channel: they were not able to touch one of them. We have been able to use the open English Channel as securely as if it had been an inland lake. Elsewhere the silent victory of our naval power has been almost equally complete. It is true that a few German cruisers and converted liners, roaming about the world, have done an appreciable amount of damage to British shipping; but, in the main, British commerce has been carried on in British ships without serious interruption, while the German mercantile flag has vanished from the seas. Nor does the

naval victory end here. A great armada of transports bearing Indian and British troops has steamed across the Indian Ocean, up the Red Sea, and across the Mediterranean, without the enemy venturing to fire a shot at it. In the South Seas, forces sent out from New Zealand and Australia have secured for the British flag the German Samoan Islands, the Bismarck Archipelago, and German New Guinea. From almost every British possession contingents of troops are on their way across the sea. All this work would have been impossible if Great Britain had not possessed overwhelming naval superiority in the North Sea. If the naval position had been reversed and the superiority had been on the German side, New Zealand and Australia, instead of sending out naval expeditions to acquire new territory for the Flag, and patriotically despatching military contingents to help the Mother country, would have been feverishly preparing to defend themselves against invasion, and anxiously watching the horizon for the approach of a German armada. Our own fate would have been sealed. But for the navy, German armies would by this time have been in occupation not of Brussels but of London, and scores of English towns and villages would have passed through the horrors that have befallen Louvain, Aerschot, Termonde, and Malines. To the British Isles and to the British Empire the navy is the beginning of everything, and in this war the navy has more than justified the confidence placed in it.

The achievements of our army give equal cause for pride. Those who were in the habit of somewhat sneering at the British army, as compared with continental armies, no longer do so. In numbers, of course, we do not seek comparison. We are compelled to put our main defensive effort into our navy, and we are also compelled by our requirements in India, in Egypt, and the Crown Colonies to maintain an army of a much more expensive type than continental countries aim at. Fortunately, we have refused—in spite of the compulsory service enthusiasts—to be led away from these two essentials into imitation of the continental idea of massed numbers. No one denies that it would have been advantageous for us if we could have put a larger number of trained men into the field on the outbreak of war; it would have been even more advantageous to Germany if she could have put

a larger number of battleships into the fighting-line. But to base any argument on these propositions is absurd. In actual life one factor in a problem cannot be altered without affecting other factors. The expense of creating the great home service army advocated by the National Service League would have compelled immediate and dangerous economies either in the navy or in the expeditionary force. What is still worse, it would have diverted the attention of the country from essentials to non-essentials, and would have tended to destroy the popular understanding of the true basis of England's power A very small percentage of the electorate has time to study history, but a large percentage can be influenced by public speeches; and there was a real danger that the advocates of compulsory service, by professing to find in our requirements of home defence a justification for their theories, might have created a popular belief that if only a rifle were put in every man's hand the expense of the navy could be reduced. The war has happily come in time to prevent this mischief. Never for a moment since war was declared has there been the least trace of public anxiety lest the Germans should invade these islands or even attempt a raid. The Territorials, specially enlisted on the official pretext that they were wanted for Home defence, promptly seized the realities of the situation, and ignoring the terms of their enlistment patriotically volunteered to give their services abroad, where alone they can be needed as long as England commands the sea.

Happily, the army which England has built up in wise pursuit of her own national needs and her traditional policy has more than fulfilled her expectations. Officers and men alike have understood their work, and they have faced fatigue and pain and death with a courage and cheerfulness that fill the whole nation with pride. Man for man, they are more than the equals of their opponents; and there is good reason to believe that their heroic stand at Mons and their steadfastness in retreat, coming as it did at a critical moment in the campaign, was the determining factor which saved Paris. The British army has behind it splendid traditions reaching back through long ages, but the new honours it has now won are worthy to rank with the highest achievements of the past.

In addition to these achievements of our trained soldiers,

we are able to point proudly to the spirit displayed by the civilian population. The demand for recruits met with a magnificent response, which would have been even more prompt if the country generally had realised the seriousness of the struggle in which we are involved. Those who held back for a time from enlisting certainly did not do so from any reluctance to take their share of danger, but because they were unable to realise how grave the danger to England would be if Germany were to crush Belgium and France and establish herself on the other side of the Channel. Moreover, in the first few days of the war the Government made the grave blunder of holding back bad news, and allowing the country to think that we were winning a series of brilliant victories when we were in fact being driven back day after day. As soon as it became clear to the public that the Germans were driving all before them there was a rush to enlist.

Equally enthusiastic has been the loyalty displayed by India and by the self-governing Dominions and Crown Colonies in offering to send men and money to help the Mother country. This is no new feature in our history. In the Soudanese War Australia offered a contingent ; in the Boer War contingents came from Canada, Australia, and New Zealand, and it was only because of the acuteness of the colour problem in South Africa that Indian offers of help could not then be accepted. Even so, the Indians in Natal organised a corps of stretcher-bearers who did immensely valuable work on the field of battle, often under fire. Fortunately, there is no colour problem in Europe in the bitter sense in which that phrase is understood in countries across the seas ; and when that wonderful despatch from Lord Hardinge enumerating the offers that were pouring in upon him was communicated to Parliament, a thrill of gratitude and pride ran through the country—gratitude for this spontaneous help from innumerable races of men knowing England only by name ; pride that England's work in India, often criticised, rarely praised, should have received this triumphant reward. Even now, amid the multitude of other incidents crowding one upon another in the great world drama through which we are passing, it is difficult to think without emotion of this outpouring of Indian loyalty. The men who thus spontaneously offered their lives and their possessions for the service of the Empire are not of our race

nor of our religion; few of them have learnt to speak our language; they only know of our traditions at second hand. Yet they have come forward with an enthusiasm which equals, even if it does not surpass, the enthusiasm of our own people at home.

To praise the action of Canada, Australia, and New Zealand would be almost an impertinence, for the people of these great Dominions are blood of our blood and bone of our bone; though the French Canadians, it is important to note, have worthily played their part, as they did in the South African War. On this occasion they have a double call: the call of France and the call of England. The case of South Africa stands in a different category. It is only a dozen years since we were fighting against the Boers: fighting as it seemed to deprive them of their independence. Yet, instead of nursing hatred in their hearts, the Boers have—with but few exceptions—thrown in their lot with the British and taken up arms to expel the Germans from South Africa. This remarkable revolution in the attitude of the Boers towards the British must be primarily attributed to the courageous action of the late Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman in deciding to give complete colonial self-government to the Transvaal. The Boers have learnt that they are as free under the Union Jack as under the Vierkleur, and that the Empire, while guarding their liberties and leaving them to choose their own lines of development, offers them, without conditions, a partnership in a world-wide heritage.

Attempts have been made to find a parallel between the Transvaal and Ireland; but they will not bear analysis. Ireland, since the Act of Union, has enjoyed as full a measure of self-government as England or Scotland or Wales: indeed, a fuller measure, for she has been for half a century greatly over-represented in the common Parliament. The Transvaal after the war, and until the grant of self-government, was ruled as a Crown Colony and had no representation of any kind in the Parliament which was the ultimate source of authority. Ireland could make and unmake British ministries; the Transvaal was subject to an external despotism, benevolent and tolerant no doubt, but nevertheless a despotism. It is, therefore, impossible to plead the cause of Home Rule for Ireland with the same arguments as those employed to justify the grant of self-government to the Transvaal. The Irish

demand for Home Rule is based on sentimental rather than practical considerations. It is none the worse on that account; but the difficulty has always been to satisfy the Nationalist sentiment without outraging the Ulster sentiment. The Irish Nationalists have not been content to demand autonomy for themselves; they have claimed also to impose their rule upon another people. In addition, all schemes of Home Rule for Ireland hitherto put forward have involved injustice, both financial and constitutional, to Great Britain. These considerations entirely separate the problem of Irish Home Rule from the problem of Colonial self-government. Nevertheless it is possible that in the complex circumstances created by this great, world-wide struggle the Government did right in gratifying Irish Nationalist sentiment by placing the Home Rule Bill on the statute book. The proposed scheme of Home Rule cannot be brought into being for more than a year, and even then the members of the Cabinet have pledged themselves that the rule of Dublin shall not be forced upon Ulster against her will. Meanwhile the co-operation of Nationalists and Unionists in defence of the Empire can hardly fail to effect a change in their mutual relationship, and it may be that before the twelve months run out they will have arrived at an agreement for a scheme of autonomous government which will satisfy the sentiments of both Irish parties, without subjecting Great Britain to the gross injustice involved in the present scheme of Home Rule. It was worth while to run some risks to secure a reconciliation with the Irish Nationalists at a moment when all the rest of the Empire is at one.

But navies and armies cannot live on moral enthusiasm alone. It is necessary to have behind them an industrious community producing rapidly and efficiently the means to support the fighting forces. In this respect we can congratulate ourselves that we occupy a stronger position than either of our opponents, or indeed than any of our allies. Our insular position, combined with our command of the sea, renders our industries less liable to interruption by war than those of any other European Power. Some interruption, of course, there has been. We have lost the very important market for our goods that Germany usually offers; and it is well to remember that in normal years Germany actually

holds the second place in the list of our customers, the first being held by India. In addition, we have lost the valuable materials which we were in the habit of importing from Germany, and we have found some of them extremely difficult to replace. These are serious losses, but we can largely console ourselves with the reflection that the losses of Germany under these heads are both absolutely and proportionately very much greater. We lose, on the ground of direct belligerency, our whole trade with Germany and Austria ; on the same ground Germany loses not only her trade with us, but also her trade with France, Russia, Belgium, Serbia, Japan, India, Canada, Australia, New Zealand, British South Africa, and with all British, French, Belgian, and Japanese possessions throughout the world. In addition, she loses her trade with her own oversea possessions, or what were her possessions when the war began. Measured in money, taking imports and exports together, our loss is at the rate of £124,000,000 a year, Germany's at the rate of £424,000,000 ; our loss represents 10 per cent. of our total external trade ; Germany's represents 44 per cent. of her corresponding total. These are only the primary losses due to the state of belligerency. So far as trade with neutrals is concerned, Germany is legally as free to trade as we are ; practically the greater part of her trade with neutrals is destroyed by our command of the sea, and our merchants and manufacturers are rapidly invading her markets. She is in fact reduced to trading with or through Holland, Switzerland, Denmark, Roumania, and Italy, and to such trade as she can carry on with her own defeated and almost ruined ally. Doubtless some trade is thus being carried on between Germany and the outer world, but it is obviously insufficient to keep her once busy factories at work, even if the factories could be run with the old men and the women who alone are not called out to serve as cannon fodder.

The interruption to our own industries has arisen from a cause which few members of the general public would have suspected before the war began. All commerce requires a medium of exchange, and the medium for the greater part of international commerce is a bill of exchange (or cheque) drawn upon London. A bill of exchange is perhaps best described as a written order for payment, and when Chicago sells wheat to Hamburg the natural course would appear to be that the

order for payment should be made payable in Hamburg or at any rate in Berlin. In practice it is made payable in London, because bills on London are more easily negotiable all the world over than bills on any other city. The primary reason for the preference given to bills on London is that London alone of all the capitals of the world maintains an open market for gold, so that if anybody wishes to obtain gold—the one universal currency—a bill on London will give him power to do so. Thus good bills on London are in London as good as gold, and elsewhere they are sometimes even better than gold because they can be sent safely through the post at insignificant cost, whereas the transport of gold is an expensive business. There are other causes for the pre-eminence of bills drawn on London—the security of England from invasion because of our insular position and because of our naval supremacy; the magnitude and wide distribution of our trade, so that all parts of the world are in direct financial relationship with London; the elasticity of our banking system, with its subsidiary and highly specialised machinery of Accepting Houses and Bill Brokers, which enables credit to be easily obtained in London against which to draw a bill, and also enables bills drawn for a future date to be easily turned into immediate cash.

The result of all these advantages is that bills of exchange or cheques drawn upon London have become the almost universal currency for international transactions. But the whole working of this system clearly depends upon credit, upon 'scraps of paper' with certain names attached to them. If for any reason doubt should arise as to the ability of the various signatories to make good the promises implied by their signatures the whole system ceases to work. That is just what happened on the outbreak of war. Normally the stream of obligations falling due to be paid is met by a stream of credits with which to pay. Food and raw materials come in, manufactured goods go out; fresh capital is sent abroad for investment, payments are received for interest on capital already invested; our shipowners receive in London their payments for services rendered in carrying goods round the world; India sends to London credits to meet furlough allowances and pensions of civil servants and soldiers; British tourists all over the Continent draw from London the large

sums they annually spend on their holidays ; America transmits to London credits to cover the expenditure of the vast army of American tourists ; finally, there are frequent movements of gold in bars or coin, whenever the rate of exchange in any financial centre makes it profitable to send gold to London or to fetch gold from London. The outbreak of war involved of necessity the sudden cessation of a large proportion of these transactions. For example, the Germans who owed money in London could not pay it ; reciprocally, of course, Englishmen owing money to Germany could not pay their debts—that would have been the worst form of trading with the enemy. It so happens that there was a heavy balance due to us, but even if the accounts had been equal there was no mechanism by which Mr. Smith of Huddersfield, who owed a German firm of dye manufacturers £1000, could get into touch with Mr. Alexander of Paisley, who had a claim on Germany for £500 for thread supplied, and Mr. Brown of Leeds, who was owed £300 for a piece of machinery, and Mr. Boon of Belfast, who was owed £200 for linen goods. These various transactions were financially represented by bills drawn on various Accepting Houses falling due at various dates, discounted by various Bill Brokers, and lodged with various bankers. In the ordinary course, these transactions, combined with thousands of similar character, would mutually cancel one another, though the process of cancellation would be spread over many months. But with the sudden snapping of the bonds of credit it was impossible for the various traders concerned to improvise machinery for setting off the hundreds of debts due from English firms to German firms against the hundreds due the other way.

It is, however, open to question whether some step in this direction might not have wisely formed part of the bold emergency measures undertaken by the Government. For example, the Government might conceivably have established a temporary clearing-house for the adjustment of claims and counter-claims. The balance due from Germany, or, for the sake of greater caution, 90 per cent. of it, could have legitimately been advanced by the British Government, to be subsequently recovered from the German Government as part of the *post bellum* settlement. This would not have involved greater risks than a commercial country must take in time of

war, and it would have immediately removed one of the causes of the stoppage of the financial machine.

There were, however, many other causes—for example, the heavy indebtedness of the United States to this country and the apparent reluctance of the Americans to pay their debts in gold at a time when they were boasting that they needed no moratorium. Some of the steps actually taken by the Government may, in the light of subsequent events, be open to criticism, but prompt action was necessary, and the steps taken were those which seemed at the moment the best to the competent advisers whom the Chancellor of the Exchequer consulted. The best of the emergency measures of the Government was the arrangement announced in a Treasury circular of the 4th of September for clearing pre-moratorium bills out of the way and assisting the Accepting Houses to accept new bills so as to start new business. The moratorium was absolutely necessary, but credit is due to the Government for bringing it to an end at the earliest possible moment. It is interesting to record, as a proof of the inherent soundness of English trading, that many wholesale firms found that they actually received payments more promptly after the moratorium was proclaimed than in normal times. Their customers not only declined to avail themselves of the moratorium but paid their accounts with exceptional promptitude.

In addition to dealing with these purely financial, but fundamentally important, problems, the Government also undertook the business of insuring British ships against war risks. This was a necessary step owing to the absence of any adequate commercial machinery for dealing with risks caused by the King's enemies. It is, however, worth noting that at least one shipping firm had—to the personal knowledge of the present writer—made a practice for years past of insuring against all war risks. The extra premium charged through these years of peace was very small because the contingency of war was regarded as remote, and if all shipowners had shown equal prevision the underwriters would have built up a fund which would have more than sufficed to meet the losses likely to be recorded in the present war. As that precaution had not been generally taken the Government wisely put into operation without delay the scheme of State insurance drawn up in May 1913 by a sub-Committee of the Committee of

Imperial Defence. The premiums charged in the first instance were high, but ships with urgent cargoes were able to sail, and in a very short time experience showed that, as the result of our naval supremacy, the risks were much less than had been anticipated. In this connexion the highest praise is due to the way in which the Committee of Imperial Defence has for years past been thinking out the problems of war and quietly preparing to meet them. This Committee, the creation of Mr. Balfour's foresight, has proved one of the most important elements in our constitution.

The enormous activity of the Government on the outbreak of war and the remarkable ability displayed by members of the Government in dealing with new, or partially new, problems seem to have given considerable encouragement to the advocates of State socialism. If the State can handle these financial and commercial problems so well in time of war—runs the argument—why should it not undertake to manage the trade of the country in peace? It might be deemed sufficient to parry this argument with the gibe that socialism is a costly contrivance if a great European war is required to make it practicable. But the serious answer is that services, which in time of peace are essentially private, in war assume a public character. In time of war the whole nation becomes one unit moving with all its strength against other nations. Not only must private interests be ruthlessly over-ridden if they stand in the way of national success, but also private enterprises must be redirected, if necessary, into those channels which most conduce to the assistance of the nation in the great purpose of war. Industries and activities, which in time of peace can be left to the care of those whose private profit depends on their success, become, in time of war, of national as well as private importance, and it is right that the Government should use its compulsory power and its financial resources to control and assist in the nation's interest the operations of private firms.

In time of peace, if a particular shipowner keeps his ships laid up for any reason, the nation need not worry: other shipowners will step into his place, or the freight market will adjust itself. In the same way, in time of peace, if a firm, whose business it is to accept bills of exchange, finds itself unable to meet its commitments it goes under, but not a ripple

is produced on the general surface of the national life. In time of war the whole situation is altered. The war itself is a factor of terrific weight, upsetting all previous calculations and cutting across thousands of contracts. On this account alone the Government would be entitled to intervene to mitigate as far as possible the individual losses caused by the collective action of the nation in declaring war. But the conclusive argument for Government intervention is that the maintenance of such industries as, for example, shipping and bill accepting, is vital to the nation; the capacity of these industries to maintain themselves in time of peace without Government assistance has been demonstrated by their success; in time of war they are faced with new conditions, which the Government alone can deal with and must deal with.

It is hardly necessary to add that the essence of Government intervention is the employment of the irresistible force and the almost unlimited credit of the State. Government employees, whether they be politicians or civil servants, have no special ability as compared with their fellow citizens engaged in private trade, and their training largely unfits them for dealing with trade problems. The main pre-occupation of a politician is to win votes by the use of arguments and phrases which will excite popular enthusiasm, and by the misrepresentation of the actions and opinions of his opponents; the main pre-occupation of a civil servant is to keep the machine, in which he is little more than a cog, smoothly running. It is fortunate for England that at a great crisis in her history she had at her service an almost unlimited supply of men of first-class ability trained in the best of all schools—the school of individual enterprise. It was these men who advised the Government as to the commercial steps to be taken on the outbreak of war, and it is to their advice that the success achieved is mainly due. At the same time the nation owes gratitude to members of the Government for so promptly seeking advice from those competent to give it, for tactfully holding the balance between conflicting commercial interests, and for courageously taking action at the earliest moment.

As an individual example of the mental confusion induced by socialist theories, it is worth while to note that it is only among socialists that a few men have been found ready to risk the danger of injuring their country in order to indulge

in the pleasure of criticising its diplomacy. In time of peace there is no sufficient reason why the field of foreign policy should be exempt from criticism ; but when battle is joined, or about to be joined, to accuse the responsible foreign minister of Great Britain of duplicity and hypocrisy is an act of moral treason. The socialist newspaper and the socialist politician responsible for these charges had of course no intention of injuring their country's cause. Their action was a piece of vanity and wrong-headedness. The curious point is that men who in peace advocate the substitution of universal State control for the rule of individual liberty, cannot, in time of war, when everything should be sacrificed to national unity, bring themselves to sacrifice their own individual vanity. Happily for them, the law of liberty still rules in England, and though their words have been seized upon by our enemies and converted into weapons against us, this little group suffers no penalty and even remains free to publish more pro-German pamphlets.

Yet, in the long run, it is England and not her critics who gain by the law of liberty. If the British Isles and the British Empire had been subject to the kind of tyranny that is the very essence of German bureaucratic rule, we should never have witnessed the magnificent outburst of loyalty that has come from all the multitudinous races that live beneath the British flag. They have rallied to that flag because it is the flag of freedom. Under it, they have been free to live their own lives in their own way, and therefore for it they are willing to die.

EDITOR.

No. 451 *will be published in January.*

INDEX

Titles of Articles are printed in heavy type.

Acton, Lord, *cited*, 21
Algiers, The Pirates of, 149
Anglo-French *entente*, The, 264–5

Babasaheb, Meherban Narayanrao, *Impressions of British Life*, 180, 182
Bagehot, Walter, The Life of, 180, 191–3
Bailey, Rt. Hon. W. F., Life in Croatia, 356
Balkan League, 47–8, 53
Balkan War, 300–1, 372
Belgian independence, 18, 19, 454–5; intellectual activity, 315 *et seq.*
Belgium, as victim of the German doctrine of necessity, 294 *et seq.*, 298
Best, Elsdon, *Maori Religion*, quoted, 100
Bismarck, Prince, 15 *et seq.*; 61–4, 67, 274 *et seq.*
Bland, J. O. P., The Future of China, 427
Bleackley, Horace, Casanova, 135.
Bourget, Paul, *Le Demon de Midi*, 318, 331
Budge, E. Wallis, *Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection*, 96, 109, 113
Bryce, Lord, *The Roman and the British Empires*, 239, 251

Casanova, 135; the Memoirs of Casanova, 135–7, 143, 145–7; early life, 137; the Senator Bragadin, 137–8, 141, 145; life in Venice, 138; Henriette, 138, 143, 145, 147; first visit to Paris, 139; returns to Venice, 139; arrested by the Inquisition, 139–40; escape from 'The Leads,' 140; the Marquise d'Urfé, 140–1; wanderings over the Continent, 141; becomes a secret agent of the Inquisitors, 141, 142; again visits Paris: becomes librarian to Count Waldstein, 142; death at Dux, 143; the *Lettres de Femmes à Jacques Casanova*, 143–5; Manon, 143–4, 147; Marianne de Charpillon, 144–5; M. Samaran's book, 145–6; Casanova's connexion with the French stage, 146; appreciation of his character, 147
Cavour, Count, 8, 13, 62
de Chènier, L. S., *Les corsaires barbaresques*, 149, 157
Chamberlain, Houston Stewart, *cited*, 268, 271
China, The Future of, 427; dependence upon Yuan Shih-K'ai, 428–9; reaction of the European War upon policy in the Far East, 429, 433, 445; cosmopolitan finance and China's financial stability, 430; China and the balance of power in the Pacific, 430; policy of Great Britain and the United States, 430–1, 433, 444; Treaty of Portsmouth, 429, 430, 432, 442, 446; ineffectiveness of the 'open door' policy, 431, 442; England's first Treaty of Alliance with Japan, 431; the Russo-Japanese Agreement, 432; renewal of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance, 432; the 'spheres of influence' régime, 432, 433; the problem of the immediate future, 434; the reversion to autocratic government, 434; the selection of officials, 434, 435; Yuan's policy, 435; corruption and frenzied finance, 435–7; the short-term debts, 437–8; minor and provincial loans, 438; railway and mining concessions, 439 *et seq.*; French encroachments and British Treaty rights, 440; extension of French influence in South-west China, 440; extension by Germany, 441; Japanese policy,

441–2; British reversion to the 'sphere of policy,' 443–5; the abandonment of our special interests in the Yangtsze, 443–4; attitude to Japanese expansion, 445; a new international guarantee of the integrity of China required, 445–6, 449; reconciliation of existing rights and interests, 446; Russia and Japan in Mongolia and Manchuria, 446–7; Weihaiwei, 447; concessions, 447; differential tariffs, 447; awakening of public opinion in America, 447; America's policy, 448–9; financial educational and administrative reforms, 449–51; the Imperial Maritime Customs, 449–50

Clarendon, Life and Letters of the Fourth Earl of, 1–4, 6, 7, 9, 19, 23, 25

Collins, Churton, *Voltaire, Montesquien and Rousseau in England*, 392, 393, 397, 401

Comparative Study of Empire, A, 239

Cox, Harold, The Rating of Site Values, 215; The War, 452

Cramb, J. A., *Germany and England*, 257, 266

Crispi, Francesco, 62 *et seq.*, 274

Croatia, Life in, 356; the province of Croatia-Slavonia, 356–7; the people, 358–61, 369; the Uskoks, 359; government hindrance to progress, 361, 371; the State railways, 361; the best way to see the country, 361; domestic life, 361 *et seq.*; the 'Gospoda,' 362; a typical Croatian home, 362; women's work, 363, 364; indolence of the men, 363, 364; garlic, 363; an agricultural country, 363, 364; artistic people, 364; national appreciation of colour and form, 365; appreciation of music, 365; the Hungarian melodies, 365; Magyar plagiarists, 365; character of the national music, 365–6, 367; religious and national aspirations, 366, 372; love and marriage, 367–8; wedding customs, 368–9; religion, 368; baptisms, deaths and religious fêtes, 370 *et seq.*; Easter Monday custom, 370; salutations, 370; survival of Pagan traditions, 370; beggars, 371; effect of forced emigration on Slavonic progress, 371; British ideas in, 371; farcical autonomy, 372; character of Hungarian rule, 372; the Balkan War, 372; Austria and the Southern Slav question, 372

Cromer, Lord, *Ancient and Modern Imperialism*, 239, 253, 255

Current Literature, 180

De la Mare, Walter, Current Literature, 180; Popular Poetry, 412

De Montmorency, J. E. G., The English Universities and National Life, 196

Diplomacy, English, A Chapter of, 1853-1871...1

Disraeli, *cited*, 25

Empire, The Comparative Study of, 239, 242; neglected by the masters in this country, 239; the comparative method of history, 239; the story of British India, 240; imperial side of our annals neglected by the Victorian writers, 240; the Oxford School, 240–1; devotion to Teutonic and medieval antiquities, 240; Freeman, 240; Statesmen and Empire studies, 241–2; underrating the Empire, 242; Imperialism, 242; the Spanish Colonial Empire, 243 *et seq.*; our disdainful attitude towards oversea enterprises of other European nations, 243–4; Argentina, 244; and the South American Nations, 245; British colonisation not assimilative, 245, 246; the Spanish method assimilative, 245, 246; the newness of the British Empire, 246–7; the Roman Empire, 246, 247 *et seq.*; slavery the base of the social fabric, 249; the *pax Romana*, 250; proximate cause for the collapse of the Western Empire, 250–1; Imperial organisation: the task of the Roman administration and our own compared, 251; Roman sentiment of social and cultured superiority, 252–3; the colour-line distinction of modern growth, 252, 253; the Roman Government, 254–5

English Diplomacy, 1853–1871, A Chapter of, 1; English indifference to European diplomacy, 1–2; the diplomatic situation in 1853...4; Russia, England and the Eastern Question, 5; the Russian demand for a protectorate over Greek Christians, 5, 6–8; the Crimean War, 5, 7, 8; Cavour, 8, 9, 11, 13, 14; Napoleon's

Italian policy, 9, 11; England and the Italian question, 9 *et seq.*; the Italo-Austrian War, 11; Villafranca, 11, 12; the influence of Prussia, 12; Great Britain's service to the cause of Italian unity, 13–14; Bismarck, 15 *et seq.*; the Schleswig-Holstein question, 15–16; dynastic influences in England, 16; desertion of Denmark: reaction upon English prestige, 17; Bismarck's impression of British policy, 17; the keynote of Russell's diplomacy, 17; the defeat of Austria, 17, 18; Bismarck and Napoleon, 18 *et seq.*; the events preceding the Franco-German War (1870), 19 *et seq.*; errors of French diplomacy, 20; Bismarck's diplomacy, 21, 22; the Hohenzollern candidature for the Spanish throne, 21; the Ems telegram, 22; Great Britain's part, 22 *et seq.*; Clarendon and Bismarck, 23; consequences of the war, 23, 24; character of British diplomacy during the mid-Victorian era, 24; attitude towards Imperial questions, 24, 25; reaction, 25

English Universities and National Life, The, 196; present defects in our educational system, 196–7; history of the Universities, 198 *et seq*; Oxford and Paris, 198; Oxford and Cambridge, 199; influence of the University in past times, 200; all classes represented, 200; growth of hostels, 201; Merton, 201; Peterhouse, 201; independent endowment of colleges, 201; privileges from the Crown and Courts, 201–2; Universities in the seventeenth century, 202; educational reformers in the nineteenth century, 203; the degradation after the Restoration, 203; revival, 204–5; Bishop Copleston, 204–5; Sir William Hamilton, 205; University Reform, 205–6; Tests and Finance, 206; the Universities and National Education, 207; Mr. Tillyard's scheme of internal reform for Cambridge, 207–8; the younger Universities, 208–10, 211–12; the Universities and the Board of Education, 210; relation to the poorer classes of society, 210–11; the Extension Movement, 211–12; the University of London, 212–13, 214; the problem of South London, 212–13, 214; Goldsmith's College, 213; educational history of the Metropolis, 213

Eucken, Professor, *cited*, 296

Eve, Trustram, *Rating on Land Values*, 215, 217, 237

Expansion of Italy, The, 60

Faquet, Émile, *cited*, 38

France: War and Literature in, 317 *et seq.*

Garibaldi, 13, 14

German Colonies, The, 298–9, 304 *et seq*; spheres of influence, 299; designs on Tripoli: effect on the Triple Alliance, 299–300; German privileged position in Turkey, 300; the Balkan War, 300–1; Servia: the *casus belli*, 301; Russia's policy, 301; Germany's plans, 302–3; plans probably aimed at Great Britain, 302; designs on French Colonies, 303; German Colonies as compensation to the Allies, 304 *et seq.*; Togoland, 304, 308; the Cameroons, 304, 308; German South-West Africa, 305–6, 308, 310; East Africa, 306–7, 309–10; New Guinea, 307; the Pacific islands, 307; Kiao-Chau, 307; probable Russian claims, 307; Cyprus, 308; participation by Italy, 308; French influence in Syria, 308; capital value of German overseas possessions, 308; appreciation of Germany as a Colonial Power, 310–12; treatment of native races, 310; Germany's trade with her Colonies, 311; a pledge for the future, 312

Germanism and Prussianism, 257; literature and thought of modern Germany neglected in England, 258; Prussianism the result of evolution, 259; the Germany of the Middle Ages, 259–60; the Thirty Years' War, 260; consolidation, 260–1; the effect of the geographical situation on Prussia and Germany, 261; the Slav nightmare, 261, 264; the cult of war, 262–3; Great Britain and German policy, 263; efforts to preserve peace, 264; the Anglo-French *entente*, 264–5; German civilisation, 266–71; popularity of the Germanic idea in England, 269–70; the influence of Carlyle,

269; the German a theorist, 271; German characteristics, 271–2; unity of intellectual and political life, 273; the dominance of Prussianism, 273; the war as the legacy of Bismarck, 274; Bismarck's policy, 274–6; present policy not Bismarckian, 276–7
Germany and the Laws of War, 278; the Thirty Years' War: Tilly and the destruction of Magdeburg, 278–9, 280, 282, 295; a common law of international relations formulated, 279; the work of Grotius, 279, 280, 281; international law and moral sanction, 279; Magdeburg compared with Louvain, 280; warfare in the Middle Ages, 280, 283; the Free Companies, 280; wars of reprisals, 280; the doctrine of neutrality undeveloped in the seventeenth century, 281; Richard Zouche, 281, 282; attention to military discipline in England, 282; Puffendorf, 282; Cornelius van Bynkershoek, 282; Vattel, 283; Napoleon's wars, 283; the Prussian Army under Blücher, 283; differences between neutrals and belligerents, 284; definite international conventions, 284; Declaration of Paris, 284–5, 291; right of seizure of property at sea, 284, 290; code of laws for war on land, 285, 286; the Convention of Geneva, 285, 287, 292; the Declaration of St. Petersburg, 285; the Hague Conferences, 286, 291, 292; as to prisoners of war, 287, 296; rights of belligerents not unlimited, 287; the 'ruses' of war, 287–8; pillage, 288, 289, 296; bombardment of undefended towns, etc., 288; the German doctrine of 'War Treason' (*Kriegsverrath*), 288, 296; money contributions, 289, 291, 296; requisitions, 290; reprisals, 290; fishing vessels, 290, 291, 296; bombardment by naval forces, 291; as to fighting at sea, 291; mines, 291, 292; privateering, 291; converted ships, 291; resistance of capture by merchant ships, 291; the doctrine of necessity, 293–4; conduct of the German campaign in Belgium, 295–6; Louvain, 295, 297; German behaviour in France, 296; instances of German defiance of law, 296; the corrupting influence of the German doctrines, 296; the reassertion of the authority of civilisation, 290, 296–7
Gladstone, Mr., *cited*, 10, 19; *quoted*, 17, 20
Gosse, Edmund, War and Literature, 313
Greek Music, 115; meaning of the word music to the Greeks, 115; instrumental music, 115–16, 120; the lyre, 116 *et seq.*; the flute, 116; Greeks dislike of *loud* noise, 116; the *chelys*, 116; the *cithara*, 117; the *aulos*, 117, 118; the syrinx, 118; the *phorbeia*, 119; forms of the pipes, 119; the *plagiaulos*, 119; the pipe usually played by girls, 119; Greek dislike of the specialist, 119; musical theory, 120 *et seq.*; musical art and eccentrics, 120; Pythagoras, 120, 122; theories of Plato, 120; the Asclepiadae, 120; the musical scale, 121; laws evolved from the simple tetrachord, 121; Terpander's lyre, 121; the octave system, 121; harmonies, 122; 'theatrical tropes,' 122; Ion of Chios: the Lesser Perfect system, 122; the keynote in the scales, 122; Aristoxenus, 123; his Harmonics, 123–4; later developments of musical theory, 124; vocal music the highest form of music, 124; syllables the material of music, 124; length of syllables, 125; long runs of short syllable notes, 125; varieties of Greek melic poetry, 125, 127, 128; the dithyramb, 126, 127; the *nome*, 126; 127; Timotheus of Miletus, 127; methods of Timotheus and Strauss compared, 127; the original meaning of the word Hymn, 127; the Epinikion or Triumphal Ode, 127; Pindar, 128; the Prosodion and the Paean, the Skolion, and other musical forms, 128; Greek musicians and analogies among the moderns, 128; Pindar and Bach, 128–9; Aeschylus and Beethoven, 129; Sophocles and Mendelssohn, 129; Euripides and Mozart, 130, 131; Aristophanes and Richard Strauss, 130; Greek musical methods essentially different from ours, 131; ideas connoted by rhythms, 132–3; management of rhythms, 133–4
Grey, Sir Edward, 264, 453
Gribble, Francis, Servia Irredenta, 41
Grotius, the work of, 279, 280, 281

Higgins, C. Pearce, *The Hague Peace Conferences*, 278, 286
Home Rule Bill, 462
Hull, J. A., *The Law of Naval Warfare*, 278, 291, 292, 294

Impressions of British Life and Character, 180, 182
Italian Unity. *See under* English Diplomacy.
Italy, The Expansion of, 60, 76; Franco-Italian relations, 60, 61; Victor Emmanuel's visit to Vienna and to Berlin, 61; the fall of the Right, 61, 62; Depretis' efforts to conciliate the Church, 62; Francesco Crispi, 62, 72; secret mission to the principal European Courts, 63–5; Depretis' suggestion for a German-Italian treaty of alliance, 63, 64; Crispi and Bismarck, 63, 64; Crispi in London, 64; English attitude to the extension of Austrian power, 64; Italian fear of France and Anstria, 65; Germany and Austria defensive alliance against Russia, 65; the French expedition to Tunis, 65–66; the rioting in Rome, 66; the Triple Alliance, 61, 65–67, 77; emigration and the growth of modern Italy, 67–9, 71; emigration causing difficulties with foreign countries, 69; Italians in Tunisia, 69; the annexation of Tripolitania, 69, 74, 75, 76; Italians in the Turkish Empire, 69; the internal regeneration of Italy, 70; birth-rate and death-rate, 70; war against insanitary conditions, 71; malaria, 71; the agrarian situation, 71; organisation of Labour, 71; agricultural and mineral products, 72; other industries, 72; finance since the Risorgimento, 72, 74; parliamentary suffrage, 73; education, 73–4; motives of Italy, 75; the Italo-Turkish War, 76; argument for an alliance with France, 77–8

Johnston, Sir H. H., The German Colonies, 298; *cited*, 98

Kinglake's *Invasion of the Crimea*, 4, 7

Lacaita, Sir James, 13
Land taxation. *See* Rating of Site Values.
Literature, Current, 180
Literature, effect of the war on, 313
Louvain, 314
Low, Sidney, A Comparative Study of Empire, 239; Germanism and Prussianism, 257
Lucas, Sir C. P., *Greater Rome and Greater Britain*, 239 *et seq. passim*
Lueder doctrine of the laws of war, *cited*, 293
Luxemburg, 19, 454–5
Lyons, Lord, A Record of British Diplomacy, 1, 2, 4, 19–20, 22–3

Maarten Maartens, The Works of, 180, 193
Magdeburg, the destruction of, 278–9, 280, 282, 295
Malet, Sir Alexander, *The Overthrow of the Germanic Confederation*, 1, 17
Marriott, J. A. R., A Chapter of English Diplomacy, 1853–1871...1
Mecklenburg, Duke of, *From the Congo to the Niger and the Nile*, 96, 109, 110
Micheli, Dr. Horace, The Referendum at Work, 26
Monroe Doctrine, 448
Moore, Arthur, *The Orient Express*, 180
Morier, Sir Robert, Memoirs and Letters, 1, 2, 4, 8, 11, 15
Music, Greek, 115; Croatian Music, 365

Napoleon III., 4–15 *passim*
National Records, The, 373; uses of the national archives, 373–4, 384–5; national responsibilities in respect of public records, 374; inquiries into the state of the Public Records, 375; administration of the Record Office, 375–6; the Historical Manuscripts Commission, 376, 388; Record Office detachment from scientific methods, 376; origin of the Royal Commission of Inquiry, 1910...376; the Welsh Courts of Justice records, 377; difficulties of a Royal Commission, 377–9; previous inquiries, 378; Report and recommendations of the Commissioners, 379 *et seq.*; want of method in preservation of state documents, 380–1; superfluous records, 381; disposal of records condemned for destruction, 381–2, 385; comparison with continental methods, 382; change

in control recommended, 382; the Second Report of the Commission, 382 *et seq.*; 'outlying records,' 383, 390; lack of knowledge and interest of departmental officials, 383; naval and military records, 383 *et seq.*; the weeding of departmental records, 385; destruction of old service records, 385–6; the custody, repair, arrangement and description of the records, 386 *et seq.*; the Fetter Lane repository, 388; cost of departmental establishments, 389–90
Noguchi, Yone, *The Spirit of Japanese Poetry*, 180, 187

Overbergh, Cyr van, *Monographies Ethnographiques*, 96, 97, 98

Palmerston, Lord, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 24 *n.*
Panama Canal, 448
Paris, Declaration of... 1856 284, 285, 291
Paris, during the siege of 1870. *See* War and Literature.
Phillips, *The Confederation of Europe*, 1, 25
Phillipps, L. M., *In the Desert*, 149, 165
Phillipps, Miss March, The Pirates of Algiers, 149
Philipson, Dr. Coleman, *quoted*, 282
Pirates of Algiers, The, 149; Arab characteristics, 149, 159, 160, 165, 166; the Spanish Moslems, 149; the Pirate States in the making, 150; Barbarossa, 150, 151; efforts to conquer the pirates, 150, 151, 160, 163; Ali Pasha, 151; Lepanto, 151; recognised by European Powers, 152, 163; the equipages of the Arab navy; 152; the rowers, 152, 153; methods of the pirates, 153 *et seq.*, 158–9; occasional successful resistance to, 154; captivity by the Pirate States, 152, 154 *et seq.*; attempts to escape, 155; every nation in Europe represented among the enslaved, 156; renegades, 156; the Algerine maritime force in the seventeenth century, 157–8; extent of the pirates' ravages, 158–9; raids on England and Ireland, 158–9; catching a Tartar, 159; dependence upon slavery, 159–60; marvellous recuperative powers, 160, 163; agreement recognising right to hold English captives, 160; position of European States in relation to, at end of the seventeenth century, 161, 162, 163; ransoms, 162; missionary work among the slaves, 162; attitude to the consuls, 163; the French conquest of Algeria, 163–5, 166; the love of enslaving ineradicable in the Arab, 165; surviving significance of the Arab problem, 165; the Sahara, the true Arab kingdom, 165, 166
Popular Poetry, 412
Preventive Detention, 167, 177; recidivism, 167, 174, 178; the Prevention of Crime Act, 1908... 168 *et seq.*, 177; the Borstal Institution, 168, 169, 173; preventive detention for habitual criminals, 169 *et seq.*; the new scheme, 170; experience at Camp Hill Prison, 170, 174; hampering innovations in procedure, 170–2, 174, 177; habitual criminal defined, 172, 175, 176; the age standard of habituality, 173; analysis of the ages on conviction, 173; analogy of the administration of the Inebriates Act, 174; classification and segregation of prisoners, 175; the *raison d'être* of preventive detention, 175; evidence of previous sentence of penal servitude, 175, 176; accused person must be charged anew, 176, 177; intention of the Act, 177; average sentence of men sent to penal servitude, 178; suggestions, 178–9; preventive detention from the criminal's standpoint, 179; effect of the Act, 179

Queen Victoria, 10, 11, 13, 16, 17
Quinton, Dr. R. F., Preventive Detention, 167

Rashdall, Hastings, *Universities of Europe*, 196, 198
Rating of Site Values, The, 215; Exchequer grants, 215–16; Mr. Lloyd George's views, 216, 220; the essential purpose of the scheme, 217; programme of the single taxers, 217; basis of valuation, 218; taxation of improvements, 219; Town Holdings Committee, 219, 220; Royal Commission on Local Taxation, 220; the minority report, 220–1; Mr. Harper's

scheme, 220, 232; Land Values Taxation Committee, 221; the Land Value Duties, 222–4; the Mineral Rights Duty, 222; the valuation of Land Duties: methods of the Department, 225 *et seq.*; the Lumsden case, 226–7; the Norton Malreward Case, 227; the list of questions to the taxpayer, 230; the Kempe Committee, 231–2; the scheme considered, 232–3; the single tax in British Columbia, 233–5; practical objections, 236; objection to the proposal to exempt buildings from rates, 237; Mr. Trustram Eve on site values in practice, 237–8

Rattigan, Sir William, *cited*, 281

Red Cross, The, 333; Dr. John Hall's observations, 333, 334–5; the Red Cross of the Templars, 333; the badge of St. John of Jerusalem, 334; duty of the State towards the soldiers, 334, 337–8; care of sick and wounded in the Crimean War, 333, 334–6; William Howard Russell's revelations, 335, 336; the commission of inquiry, 336–8; Miss Nightingale, 335, 337, 355; the germ of the Royal Army Medical Corps, 338; army medical service in war inevitably insufficient, 338–9, 348; Japan's record in her war with Russia, 339; voluntary aid, 339; the Red Cross movement, 339, 340; Henry Dunant, 339–40, 347, 355; *Un Souvenir de Solférino*, 340; deliberations of the conference of 1863...341–2, 343; the emergence of the Red Cross, 342, 344; neutrality for all medical corps, 343, 344; Geneva Convention, 1864...343, 344, 350; voluntary relief committees, 344, 351, 352; national relief committees in England, 345 *et seq.*; the National Aid Society, 345, 347; Central British Red Cross Council, 345; the British Red Cross Society, 346, 348–50; St. John Ambulance Association, 346, 347, 348–50; the Order of St. John of Jerusalem, 345, 346–7; the St. John Ambulance Brigade, 348; the Territorials and Voluntary Aid Detachments, 348–9, 350; educational work, 348, 349; privileges accorded by international law, 350; application to naval warfare, 350; the Conference of 1906... 350–1; withdrawal of privileges to non-combatants, 351; the duties of commanders-in-chief, 352; articles relating to Voluntary Aid Societies, 351, 352–3; societies of neutral countries, 353; *modus operandi* of relief committees, 353; the distinctive emblem of the medical services, 353–5; abuse of the Red Cross, 354–5

Referendum at Work, The, 26; defects of parliamentary institutions, 26; practical working of the Swiss Referendum, 26; the problem of government in Switzerland, 26–7 military and legal reform, 27–8; constitutional reform, 28; localisation of races and religious beliefs, 29; education, 28–31; economic and social questions and the referendum, 31; the Factory Law of 1877...31–2; the Insurance Question, 32–5; M. Forrer's scheme rejected, 32–3, 34; the classical instance of the fundamental difference between people and representatives, 33; referendum a positive and beneficial influence, 35, 37; the question of a central bank of issue, 35–7; the National Swiss Bank, 37; the Initiative, 37, 39; statistics as to the referendum, 37–8; democracy and competence, 38; unification of the Swiss civil law, 38–9; the electorate and public expenditure, 39; referendum and stability of government, 40

Religions, West African, 96

Roman Campagna, The Evolution of the, 79; earliest history, 80; malaria in early days, 80, 90; as the *Patrimonium Caesaris*, 81; the nucleus of the patrimony of the Church, 81; the barbarian invasions, 82; efforts to revive agriculture, 82; agricultural policy of the papacy, 82; the *domus-cultae*, 82–3; rise of the Campagna barons, 83; jurisdiction claimed by the Roman Commune, 83; agricultural *sodalitia*, 83 *et seq.*; the *bobacterii*, 84; grazing dues, 84; the commune and the barons, 84; the Roman baronage, 84–5; feudalism established, 85; measures for re-establishment of papal authority, 86; becomes a vast pasture, 86; the Annona, 86–89; agrarian law enacted by Sixtus IV., 87; usurpations of the

barons, 87; attempts to encourage cultivation, 88, 89; the *usi civici*, 88; brigandage, 90; malaria, 90–1; agricultural methods, 91; present division, 91; the *mercanti di Campagna*, 91; chief products, 91; inhabitants and labourers, 92, 94; wages, 92; the *colonia* system, 92; the farmhouse or *casale*, 93; absenteeism and neglect, 93; laws for the reclamation of the Campagna, 93–4; land under cultivation, 94; population, 94; education, 94, 95; transforming the Campagna, 95
Rose, Dr. Holland, *cited*, 21
Russell, Lord John, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 24.

Salisbury, Lord, 8, 17
Samaran, C., *Jacques Casanova Vénitien*, 135, 142, 145–6
Servia, 301
Servia Irredenta, 41; the emergence of new nationalities, 41, 42; the settlement after Waterloo, 41–2; the spheres of Russia, Prussia and Austria, 42; situation in Austria in 1815...43; the union of Italy, 43; Hungary: the Ausgleich, 43, 57; the Bohemians, 44; forces of disruption in the Austrian Empire, 44; the German character, 44–5; German and French rule, a comparison, 45; instances of friction under the Teuton domination, 45; the *plébiscite* in Venetia, 45; Magyar domination, 46; the Emperor as the unifying element, 46; the Slav character, 46, 47, 58; the Balkan peoples, 47–8; the Balkan League, 48; Austria's problem, 49; present condition of the Slav peoples, 49–50; the Slavs of the South, 49; analogy with Italia Irredenta, 50; Mazzini's prognostication, 50; the attitude of Italy, 50; the position of the Tsar of Russia, 51; Servian lands under foreign domination, 51; Servian view of the Austrians, 52; the predominating race movement, 52, 53, 55–6; Austria and Servia not alone concerned, 53; the Balkan dissensions, 53; policy of Germany and Austria, 54; the Servian ideal, 55; Teuton and Slav irreconcilable, 56; Trialism, 56–9; Servian dissensions, 59
Shelley, H. C., The Red Cross, 333
Site Values, The Rating of, 215
Steed, H. W., *The Hapsburg Monarchy*, 41, 52, 57, 58
Stephens, Sir James Fitz-James, *cited*, 293
Strachey, Lytton, Voltaire and England, 392
Stratford de Redcliffe, Lord, 6, 7
Switzerland, the Referendum in. *See* Referendum at Work.

Tabriz, siege of, 180
Talbot, P. Amaury, West African Religions, 96
Tessmann, Günter, *Die Pangwe*, 96, 97, 110
Thorold, Algar, The Expansion of Italy, 60
Tillyard, H. L., *A History of University Reform*, 196, 206, 207
Tomassetti, Giuseppe, *La Campagna Romana*, 79, 85, 86
Torday, E., and Joyce, T. A., *Les Bushongo*, 96, 97
Tressall, Robert, *The Ragged-Trousered Philanthropists*, 180, 189
Trevelyan, G. M., *Garibaldi and the Making of Italy*, *cited*, 13

Universities, The English, and National Life, 196
Upward, Allen, *The Divine Mystery*, 96, 99, 113

Villari, Luigi, The Roman Campagna, 79
Voltaire and England, 392; his ill-treatment by the Chevalier de Rohan-Chabot, 394–5, 397; letter to Madame de Bernières, 396, 405; Madame du Deffand, 396; Voltaire's visit to England, 396 *et seq.*; stay with Everard Falkener, 397, 398; Edward Higginson, 398–9; relations with the circle of Pope Swift and Bolingbroke, 400–2; Owen Ruffhead's charge, 401–2; letters of introduction from Horace Walpole, 402; the London edition of the *Henriade*, 402, 403; literary activities in England, 403; return to France, 403; the *Lettres Philosophiques*, 403, 404 *et seq.*; England at the time of Voltaire's visit, 403–4; political references in the *Lettres*, 406; Voltaire's opinions upon Christian theology,

408–9; his account of Newton and Shakespeare, 409, 410; the *Lettres* condemned by authority, 410; retires to Cirey, 410; studies of Newton, 410
Von Bülow, Prince, *Imperial Germany*, 257, 260, 262, 272, 273
Vontade, Jacque, *The English Soul*, 180, 184–7, 191, 318, 319

Wantage, Lord, 345
War, The, 452; the dominance of the military power of Germany, 452; cessation of party strife in England, 452; realisation that war was inevitable, 453; the main object of German ambition, 453; our debt to Sir Edward Grey, 453; Germany's blundering diplomacy, 453; brutality of the declaration of war, 454; the violated neutrality of Luxemburg and Belgium, 454–5; our obligation to France, 455; the British nation and government policy, 456; our preparations, 456 *et seq.*; the work of the navy, 457–8; the achievements of the army, 458; compulsory service fallacies, 459; the recruiting, 460; the loyalty of India, the Dominions and Colonies, 460–1; attitude of the Boers, 461; no parallel between the Transvaal and Ireland, 461; the Home Rule Bill, 462; commercial losses due to the war, 462–3; collapse of the credit system, 463–6; the moratorium, 466; insurance of shipping against war risks, 466–7; the Government intervention and socialistic theories, 466 *et seq.*; socialistic criticism of foreign policy, 469
War and Literature, 313; the awakening of England, 313; Louvain, 314; Belgian intellectual activity, 315, 316; 'La Jeune Belgique,' 316; Emile Verhaeren, 315, 316; Maeterlinck, 315, 316; conditions of mental life in Belgium, 317; France, 317 *et seq.*; literature of France at a standstill, 318–9, 330; Jules Lemaître, 319; comparison with intellectual life in war of 1870...320 *et seq.*; Victor Hugo, 321, 327; *Les Châtiments*, 321; Guizot, 321–2; Alexandre Dumas père, 322–3; Jules Janin, 323; Littré, 323; Jules Sandeau, 323; Flambert, 323–4, 329; Theophile Gautier, 324–5, 329; the gatherings at the Café Brébant, 325, 328; Zola, 325; Gaston Paris, 325–6; conditions of life during the war of 1870–1..., 326; Victor de Laprade, 326; *Une Famille pendant la Guerre*, 326; Sully Prudhomme, 326, 330; arrested as a spy, 327; his *Impressions de la Guerre*, 327; injuries to art and literature under the Commune, 328; the lack of food in Paris during the siege, 328–9; the element of noise, 329; literature reasserts itself, 329, 330; de Goncourt, 329; effect of the present conditions on literature in our own country, 330–2
Ward, Sir Augustus, *cited*, 278, 279
Ward, Dr. W. E., *A Treatise on International War*, 278, 281
Weber, Max, *Cubist Poems*, 180, 189
West African Religions, 96; a connexion with the civilisation of the Egyptians, 96, 98, 100, 101, 109, 112, 113; division into two systems, 98; common doctrine of, 98, 99; principal deities of the Ekoi, 98; the religion of the Nigerian Ibibios, 99 *et seq.*; Obumo, 99, 101, 102; Eka Abassi, 99 *et seq.*, 110; comparison with supreme deity of the Maoris, 100; contents of some Ibibio sacred groves, 101; tutelary pythons, 101; symbolism in Ibibio religion, 102; the cult of Juju, 100, 103; ancestor worship, 103; secret societies, nearly all once exclusively feminine institutions, 103; the Egbo Society, 103–4, 107, 110; Leopard Societies, 104–5; the fetish Borfima, 104–5; the promotion of fertility the underlying reason for many African rites, 105, 110–11; rites of the Idiong Society, 105–8; the power of divination claimed, 107–8; the Ekkpo 'Njawhaw of the Ibibios, 108; Eka Ekkpo, 108–9; the burial rites of the Ekong Society, 109; the Moon Cult 'Sso,' 110; the 'Isis Men,' 110; purely feminine secret societies, 110; burial customs, 111–12; witchcraft, 112; spirituality in West African religions, 113
Westlake, John, *International War*, 278, 284–8 *passim*, 291, 293, 294
Wright, F. A., Greek Music, 115

Author Edinburgh Review
Title
P
LE
E
Hof. 220

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO
LIBRARY

Do not
remove
the card
from this
Pocket.

Acme Library Card Pocket
Under Pat. "Ref. Index File."
Made by LIBRARY BUREAU